United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 25, 2021 *No. 91*

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You watch over those who seek to serve Your purposes. You surround them with Your favor, providing for all their needs and empowering them to become more than conquerors in fulfilling Your will.

May the reverential gratitude of our Senators fill them with hope for all the days to come. Teach them to live lives of complete honesty as they seek to stay on the pathway You have provided for their lives.

Lord, as You teach our lawmakers to live according to Your truth, rescue them from the forces that seek to bring pain and disgrace.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I begin on the prepared remarks I have, I note that, this morning, MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, a Republican Congresswoman from Georgia, once again, compared preparations taken against COVID to the Holocaust. These are sickening, reprehensible comments, and she should stop this vile language immediately.

NOMINATION OF KRISTEN M. CLARKE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, a year ago today, on another front equally important, George Floyd was murdered in broad daylight by a police officer sworn to protect and serve. Our country was forever changed by the stomach-churning video of Derek Chauvin killing Mr. Floyd.

It sparked a summer of protest unlike any we have seen in American history. Around the world, the name of George Floyd was chanted in Rome, Paris, and London, Amsterdam, Berlin, and Mexico City. As recently as this weekend, professional soccer players in the British Premier League knelt before the game in support of the global movement against racism touched off by George Floyd.

This was not only a fight for justice for one man and his family, whom I have had the privilege to meet with, but a fight against the discrimination that Black men and women suffer at the hands of state power not just here in America but around the globe. It is a fight that continues today.

Here in the Senate, we will continue that fight when we vote to confirm the first woman—the first Black woman—to ever lead the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, which was created in 1957 as the civil rights movement began to uphold the constitutional rights of all Americans but particularly the most vulnerable. When it comes to justice in policing, the criminal justice system, and at the ballot box, the Civil Rights Division is often the tip of the spear: conducting investigations of police departments with patterns or practices of constitutional violations and defending the fundamental voting rights of every American citizen.

So, in a way, as we continue to pursue strong policing reform legislation, it is appropriate that we confirm Kristen Clarke—a proven civil rights leader—to the position of Assistant Attorney General, where she can continue the fight against bigotry in many ways. It is appropriate we do it today.

Though my Republican colleagues have tried to twist her words to make her sound like some radical, Ms. Clarke is, in reality, a hugely accomplished civil rights attorney who has earned the respect of all sides. Much like her future colleague at the Justice Department, Vanita Gupta, Kristen Clarke has been endorsed by a wide range of law enforcement groups. The truth is, Ms. Clarke will make an exceptional leader of the Civil Rights Division.

So, again, in a very significant way, as we continue to pursue strong policing reform legislation, the fight for racial justice by confirming Kristen Clarke on the anniversary of George Floyd's murder is particularly poignant and appropriate.

Of course, Congress must also pursue strong legislation to end racial bias in

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

law enforcement. Senators BOOKER and SCOTT, as well as Representative BASS and others, have been working diligently behind the scenes to fashion such a bill on a bipartisan basis. That important work must continue as we strive to ensure George Floyd's tragic death will not be in vain.

U.S. INNOVATION AND COMPETITION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on another matter, the Senate continues to work on the U.S. Innovation and Competition legislation that will lay the foundation for the next century of American economic leadership.

I have spoken a lot about the substance of this bill. So, this morning, I want to reinforce how bipartisan and inclusive this bill is. It is the product of at least a half a dozen Senate committees, meaning that nearly every single Member of the Senate has had fingerprints on this bill in one way or another.

The two pieces of legislation that form the core of the bill—the Endless Frontier Act and the Strategic Competition Act—passed out of committee on overwhelmingly bipartisan votes: 24 to 4 in the Commerce Committee and 21 to 1 in the Foreign Relations Committee. That kind of bipartisanship—almost unanimous support in multiple Senate committees—is rare when it comes to major legislation. It goes to show just how bipartisan this issue is and this legislation is as, literally, dozens of bipartisan amendments were added to the bill before it ever reached the floor.

Here on the floor, we are going to continue working through a series of amendments from both sides. With such a depth of cooperation and consensus between our two parties, there will be no reason we can't wrap up this bill this week and achieve a strong result for our country. Leader MCCONNELL should be welcoming this bipartisanship as we move forward on the bill.

WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on a final matter, later today, a group of Senators will come to the floor to highlight an important issue: DC statehood.

The District of Columbia has more residents than in Vermont and Wyoming and has nearly the same number as Delaware, Alaska, and several other States. They have the same obligations of citizenship. DC residents pay Federal taxes. They can be summoned for juries. They have served in every war since the Revolution, but they are all denied real representation here in Congress.

DC statehood is an idea whose time has come. So I want to thank Senator CARPER for organizing a group of Senators to shine a spotlight on this issue today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

ISRAEL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the world is relieved that Hamas has stopped firing rockets at Israel's cities and, for the moment, the fighting has stopped.

Israel's response to Hamas's terrorism was entirely justified. It was targeted, restrained, and extraordinarily precise. So it was disappointing to see disproportionate blame heaped upon Israel, the victim, and disproportionate pressure put on Israel's democratic, coalition government to spearhead the cease-fire with the aggressors.

Israel's actions appear to have helped restore some measure of deterrence and damaged Hamas's ability to wage terror, but we have every reason to expect the terrorist commanders will seek to rebuild their arsenal with assistance from their sponsors in Tehran.

The Biden administration must not pursue Iran policies that make this process even easier. We should not lift terrorism and missile sanctions just to leap back into discussions over the flawed Obama-era nuclear deal. Already, this administration removed terrorism sanctions on Iran's Houthi proxies in Yemen, hoping to encourage negotiations. Instead, the Houthis have escalated their offensive, rejected diplomacy, and actually fired into Saudi Arabia. Likewise, giving Iran relief from sanctions will just yield more support for terrorists like Hezbollah and Hamas.

Now, I am encouraged that the President has committed to refilling Israel's Iron Dome stockpiles. I hope his budget proposal coming this Friday will make room for increased military assistance to Israel and reflect the fact that America's interests are not served by cutting our own defense budget.

Sadly, here in Congress, more and more Democrats are falling under the anti-Israel influence of the farthest left branch. From the junior Senator from Vermont, we have a resolution to block a routine sale of precision-guided munitions that would make it harder for Israel to avoid civilian casualties as it defends itself; from a Congresswoman from New York, the accusation that Israel is an ''apartheid state.''

Historically, support for Israel has been bipartisan. During the last major flare-up with Hamas back in 2014, when hundreds of rockets were fired at Israel, the Senate passed a resolution reaffirming our support for Israel and making clear Hamas's responsibility for the violence, and we did it by unanimous consent.

Back in 2019, after another rocket attack, the Democratic leader insisted, ''No government can allow its civilians to be subject to rocket attack.'' He said he stood ''shoulder-to-shoulder with the people of Israel . . . and doing what they must do to defend their homeland.''

That was true in 2019. Well, this month's attacks involved not hundreds but literally thousands of rockets. Yet, instead of vocal support for Israel, 29 Senate Democrats pressured Israel's coalition government to stop defending itself. One of our colleagues who ran for President said the United States helping our ally means ''supplying weapons to kill children.'' Their base is energized. An open letter from hundreds of former Democratic Party and campaign staffers has urged President Biden to be harder on Israel. Apparently, a lot can change in just 2 years.

Helping Israel defend itself against terrorists shouldn't be a divisive issue. The Senate should vote on Senator SANDERS' resolution and reject it overwhelmingly.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on a related matter, the despicable, age-old specter of anti-Semitism continues to rear its head, even here in our country.

Last week, authorities from New York to Los Angeles were investigating assaults on Jewish people. According to press reports, in New York City, one Jewish man was kicked, punched, and sprayed with chemicals by five or six men yelling anti-Sematic things. That happened, by the way, right in Times Square. A synagogue in Arizona was vandalized. So was another in Illinois. A Jewish family visiting South Florida had a car pull up next to them and multiple occupants begin screaming: ''Free Palestine . . . die, Jew.'' That is what he got for wearing his yarmulke in public.

The head of the Anti-Defamation League said:

> We are tracking acts of harassment, vandalism, and violence as well as a torrent of online abuse . . . it's happening all around the world.

This garbage—this garbage didn't begin a few weeks ago. It isn't a response to geopolitics. This hatred long predates the recent fighting between Israel and Hamas, and it hasn't gone anywhere since the cease-fire.

This spring, in the shadow of this Capitol Building, a U.S. Capitol Police officer was killed in broad daylight by an unbalanced follower of the Nation of Islam, the extremist group led by the anti-Semite Louis Farrakhan.

This trash should be the easiest thing in the world for every person in a leadership position to call out. But perhaps—perhaps—because Israel has become a strangely controversial issue on the far left, the condemnations do not seem to be flowing quite as easily and unequivocally as they should.

Yesterday, a Democratic Congressman from Minnesota tweeted this:

I'll say the quiet part out loud. It's time for ''progressives'' to start condemning anti-Semitism and violent attacks on Jewish people with the same intention and vigor demonstrated in other areas of activism. The silence has been deafening.

I couldn't say it better myself.

So Senator COTTON and I are introducing new legislation to fight anti-Semitism. Our bill will support State and local law enforcement and ensure the bigoted thugs who are attacking Jewish Americans face the full force of our justice system.

I am proud to be cosponsoring this legislation, although I regret that in the year of 2021, it remains, unfortunately, necessary. I hope every one of our colleagues will join Senator COTTON and myself.

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on one final matter, the President's decision to retreat from Afghanistan is not clear-eyed or strategic; it is dangerous, wishful thinking.

As discussions with the administration are making clear, this decision is not underpinned by a coherent plan to mitigate the geopolitical and humanitarian risks that our departure will create.

When we are gone, after we leave, there is every reason to believe al-Qaida will regroup in its historic safe haven. Giving up the high ground while the enemy is still on the battlefield isn't a strategic move. Neither is banking on conducting so-called ''over the horizon'' counterterrorism missions without presence on the ground. If we have learned anything in the fight against terrorists, it is the importance of reliable access and local partnerships. Give up the former, and we likely lose the latter.

The military currently flies both reconnaissance and strike missions against terrorists from within Afghanistan. The country is not easy to get to. Its immediate neighbors are Iran, Pakistan, and Russian-influenced Central Asian nations. They aren't exactly likely to let us base significant counterterrorism units in their countries. So where will we be basing these forces? How will we maintain sorties from thousands of miles away? How many forces will be required to secure our Embassy? If a pro-Taliban mob threatens to overrun it, what will we do to protect it? Where will a quick-reaction force be based if not in Afghanistan? Will it be quick if its response time goes from minutes to hours? We learned from Benghazi the so-called tyranny of distance. If the Taliban takes Kabul, will the Biden administration recognize it as the legitimate government of Afghanistan? Will we shutter our Embassy and our aid programs? The reality is, they don't know. They can't say. There is no plan.

It is not courageous to abandon our allies. That is a view many Democrats said they held when the last President considered withdrawing from Syria and Afghanistan. But now, as Afghans, especially women and girls, face even worse dangers, many Democrats have suddenly become much less vocal. The horrific—horrific—reports of the Taliban beginning to reimpose their version of sharia law are just a taste of the catastrophes facing our friends in Afghanistan who have borne the brunt of the fight. Human rights. Women's rights. Counterterrorism refugee flows. As far as I can tell, the administration has no plan.

But the world is watching—allies and adversaries. Democrats can dress up this decision in flowery language, but the world will see it for what it is: retreating from the fight, abandoning our partners.

This is the President's decision. He chose precipitous withdrawal from Afghanistan. Unbelievably, he even chose the anniversary of September 11 as the deadline. As his team belatedly confronts him with the risks and the consequences of this decision, I hope the President will think again and reconsider.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Chiquita Brooks-LaSure, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

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

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, when I listened to the speech by Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, about Afghanistan, it transported me back in history to October of 2002, when I was a U.S. Senator representing the State of Illinois, just days away from a reelection campaign, and we faced a historic vote here in the U.S. Senate. The vote was whether or not we would invade Iraq; whether the United States would give the President the authority to send American forces to Iraq. There were 23 votes against that invasion. I was 1 of them, 22 Democrats and 1 Republican.

I can remember that night so well. It was late, past midnight, when the vote was finally taken. But we had previously taken another vote, and although I had voted against the invasion of Iraq, I saw the invasion of Afghanistan as a different story. We believed that Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida, responsible for 9/11, were in Afghanistan. And the story was—the story line, and I bought it completely—if we don't tell people like Osama bin Laden that there is a price to pay for attacking America and killing 3,000 innocent people, who are we, and who will be the next attacker?

So I voted. I voted for the invasion of Afghanistan and believed that was the right thing to do at that moment in history. That vote passed unanimously here in the Senate. There was only one dissenting vote in the House of Representatives, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California. Virtually everyone else—everyone else, both political parties—voted for the invasion of Afghanistan.

I will tell you, there was not a single Senator or Congressman who would have stood up that evening on that vote and announced ''I am prepared to vote for the longest war in American history,'' because that is what we ended up voting for.

It was our belief that if we came into Afghanistan, we could stop using this country as a haven for terrorism and we could help escort them into the 21st century.

Well, after 20 years, after thousands of Americans gave their lives and thousands more were critically injured, after the spending of trillions of dollars in Afghanistan, we learned a bitter lesson. Our willingness was not enough. The people in Afghanistan have to be prepared to embrace change for it to happen.

We had to create an army in Afghanistan, a security force. It virtually didn't exist. The warlords had their military, and they were for sale, usually, to the highest bidder. And we were trying to create a national security force. We were trying to create a nation, which was quite a challenge.

I am not going to dwell on what happened, the bitter disappointments. But when I hear Senators come to the floor saying, ''Isn't it a shame that we are leaving Afghanistan? They are going to descend into chaos and many, many problems,'' my question to them is: So what would you have us do? Continue

with the troops risking their lives in Afghanistan for another 20 years, for another trillion dollars?

Not me. I believe we have reached a point where we have to do everything we can to help Afghanistan really progress into the 21st century. Yes, I feel a personal obligation to the men and women who risked their lives for our troops.

For those who are opposed to or unaccepting of the notion of refugees coming to the United States, for goodness' sake, let us have the character to stand behind those Afghan men and women who risked their lives for our soldiers and who are now probably marked by the Taliban for death themselves. Yes, I would open our doors to them. They gave their lives for our men and women, and we should never forget it. I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle who have strong feelings about immigration would at least realize that these individuals are critically important to our role in history and our message to the rest of the world when we seek their assistance.

S. 1260

Mr. President, this week we are going to consider a critically important bill that will help secure America's role as a global leader in science and technology. The investments that the United States Innovation and Competition Act of 2021 makes in innovation will help ensure our prosperity and national security. It supports American research and development and will help to grow America's industrial and manufacturing base by investing in clean energy, cyber security, and biotechnology.

I thought a few years ago, reflected on the fact that I served in the House and Senate, there have been moments, particularly important moments that didn't receive the recognition they deserved, and one of them was a bipartisan decision by several legislators: John Porter, who was a Republican Congressman from Illinois; Senator Arlen Specter, a Republican Senator from Pennsylvania; and Senator Tom Harkin, a Democratic Senator from Iowa. Back in the day, they made a decision to try to double the research budget for the National Institutes of Health—quite an undertaking. I have seen a lot of things come and go with the Congress, and that I thought was as ambitious as it gets.

They did it. They ended up doubling the NIH budget and received some recognition for it, but far less than what they deserved.

So I went back out to the National Institutes of Health and spoke to Dr. Francis Collins, whom we are lucky as Americans to have in that position leading that great Agency. I said: Dr. Collins, I remember those days with Specter and Harkin and Porter. What can we do now, our generation, to help you at the National Institutes of Health? I don't think I can double the budget. I wish I could. But what can I do?

He said: Senator, if you could persuade Congress to give us 5 percent real growth every year—real growth over inflation—we will light up the scoreboard. These researchers will stay on the job. They won't worry about whether next year there is going to be funding. And you are going to see some remarkable things occur.

I said I will set out to do that. I knew at the time that I needed help. So I turned to PATTY MURRAY on the Democratic side, who has been our leader at the HELP Committee and on the Appropriations Committee. And we then turned to Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri, Republican leader of the subcommittee, as well as Lamar Alexander, our retired friend from the State of Tennessee.

So the four of us came together, and in a span of 5 or 6 years, we took the NIH budget from $30 billion to $40 billion, just at the right moment. We didn't anticipate COVID–19, but here it came, challenging us: Are we ready? Can we develop a vaccine in a timely fashion?

And, thank goodness we could, because of the investment that we had made as a Congress and the American people in this Agency. It paid off. Not only did we save lives in the United States; we saved lives around the world, and we will continue to because of that good work.

I came to believe that that was critically important and went to the Department of Energy, sitting down with the Secretary, 5 or 6 years ago, and told him the story about our commitment to NIH. And I said: You know, I guess it is conceivable that we will do research that will lead to some treatment of Alzheimer's and dementia. We know that it is picking up speed, unfortunately, because people are living longer.

He said: Do you have any idea what Agency of government is responsible for creating electronic means of monitoring this sort of change in our brains, the change that leads to Alzheimer's?

I said: No, I don't.

He said: Well, it is the Office of Science in the Department of Energy.

And I thought to myself: DURBIN, you should have known better. It isn't just the NIH. There are Agencies all around our Federal Government that are doing research that complement one another. So I came up with the notion to take that NIH model of 5 percent real growth and start applying it to all the other research and innovation Agencies of our Federal Government.

This bill we are considering this week, this United States Innovation and Competition Act, acknowledges that and makes the investment in research. I will tell you, I can't think of anything we can do that is more bipartisan and will be accepted by the American people than the knowledge that we are going to continue to encourage and subsidize, if you will, scientists and researchers to move us forward in innovation and technology.

This bill increases funding for the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy. That is going to spur research. It is going to help at universities around my State and all around the Nation, and it has been a priority, as I mentioned, for years.

But one important way we can compete economically in the world is by boosting support for domestic manufacturing and strengthening our domestic supply chain. The legislation that we are considering this week does that exactly: $52 billion to boost our semi-conductor manufacturing capabilities. This includes $10.5 billion for semiconductor research and development; $2 billion for legacy chip production to support the auto industry; $2 billion for research, testing, and workforce development for semiconductor needs at the Department of Defense; $500 million for coordination with foreign government partners to support international semiconductor supply chains. And importantly, this bill also ensures the payment of prevailing wages on construction projects that are supported by this funding.

Many semiconductor manufacturing jobs already pay more than typical manufacturing jobs, and they should, but the workers who will help build the facilities won't necessarily benefit from that unless we ensure the same standards that we apply to other federally funded construction projects apply here.

Research shows us that providing prevailing wage boosts worker productivity and provides good value to taxpayers. Several studies have found that construction costs are not affected by prevailing wage rates. It is our goal to compete with China and other nations, and China, unfortunately, has morally abhorrent labor practices. Let's do better. Let's show them and the world that we can do better.

In 1990, the United States produced 37 percent of the world's semiconductors. That was 30 years ago—30 years ago, 37 percent. It is 12 percent today. What a dramatic decline. We want to turn that around.

Now there are some who question us, who question whether the United States should invest in this kind of technology on semiconductors. I call them the second-place finishers. They decided that the United States can have a solid second-place finish from this point forward. I couldn't disagree more.

This Nation can lead by example and investment, and that is what this bill does. And those who are against it have to explain why giving dominance in this critical industry to another country, whether it is China or any other nation, is in the best interest of the growth of the United States and in the best interest of the next generation of American workers.

We are already facing a global shortage in microchips that led to layoffs in my State and in many other places. Illinois has been a leader in auto manufacturing, and I believe it will be in the

future, as well, thanks to dedicated workers like those at the Stellantis plant in Belvidere, IL, who assemble the car known as the Jeep Cherokee.

Unfortunately, that plant had to shut down just a few weeks ago. Why? A global shortage of semiconductors. Earlier this month, Stellantis announced as many as 1,640 employees of the plant will be laid off in July because of the shortage. A similar story at Ford's Chicago assembly plant that has 5,800 workers—this plant was idled through April, with shutdowns extending into May.

We are not seeing this only in Illinois. It has been estimated as many as 3.9 million fewer vehicles will be produced this year because of the semiconductor shortage. Last month, in the State of Kentucky—Kentucky—Ford announced the temporary shutdown of its Louisville plant, impacting more than 8,000 of its employees. And Ford's Louisville Assembly Plant, which employs nearly 4,000 workers, is expected to close through mid-July.

GM halted production lines in Tennessee and Kansas and at several other facilities this spring.

The news of these layoffs and plant closures underscores the urgent need for Congress, on a bipartisan basis, to address this microchip shortage. And the good news is that we have a real opportunity to pass legislation that will offer help to these workers and families. These investments in the CHIPS Act will not only address our immediate market needs but help to ensure that manufacturers don't face shortages in the future.

This funding will help support jobs through the entire supply chain—from construction of new facilities to manufacturing and development of chips, to workers in the auto industry who depend on this supply.

This bill makes a strategic investment that will help to counter the growing threat caused by the rapid development of China's economy. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting these important provisions to boost our domestic supply chain and support American jobs. Or we can defeat this measure. We can decide it is too much money, spending it at the wrong time. That is part of the second-place finish club, which you might find in the U.S. Senate. I don't want to be a part of it. I believe in the brains and the brawn of American workers. I believe they are productive people and that our researchers can lead the world, as they have over and over again, if we trust them and we invest in them.

I yield the floor.

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

H.R. 1

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, H.R. 1, the Democrats' supposed election integrity bill, is filled with bad ideas: making the Federal Election Commission into a partisan body; effectively banning voter ID and gutting other safeguards against voter fraud; providing for taxpayer funding of political campaigns.

Nowhere is that more true than when it comes to the bill's truly terrible provisions on the IRS.

Everyone remembers the IRS scandal during the Obama administration. Around 2013, it emerged that the Obama IRS had been unfairly singling out conservative organizations applying for tax-exempt status, slow-walking their applications and subjecting them to burdensome extra scrutiny. This had been going on for more than 2 years, and top IRS officials compounded the Agency's misdeeds by providing misleading information to Congress.

Well, Americans should brace themselves, because if H.R. 1 is ever enacted, it would allow for the same kind of targeting that went on under the Obama administration, if not worse. To start with, H.R. 1 repeals a Treasury Department rule finalized last year that was designed to help prevent the kind of abuse that went on under the Obama IRS.

Under the rule, many tax-exempt organizations are no longer required to turn over to the IRS the names and addresses of individuals who have made substantial donations. This is not information the IRS needs to know for tax purposes, and there is no reason the Agency should have information beyond what it needs to do its job.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of Leader MCCONNELL and Senator BRAUN's bill which would permanently codify the Treasury rule and its protections against unnecessary disclosure. Providing the IRS with additional extraneous information opens up opportunities for the kind of abuses we saw during the Obama administration.

But stopping IRS abuse doesn't seem to be a big priority for the Democrat Party. Indeed, there is reason to believe at least some Democrats would like the IRS to take a more aggressive role in Americans' lives. And so H.R. 1 explicitly repeals the Treasury Department rule, but that is not all.

As if Democrats were determined to prove that they intend to weaponize the IRS, H.R. 1 and S. 1, which is the Senate version of the House bill, would allow the IRS to consider organizations' views when deciding whether or not to grant them tax-exempt status. Let me repeat that. H.R. 1 and S. 1 would allow the IRS to consider an organization's views when deciding whether or not to grant that organization tax-exempt status.

It is difficult to think of a more outrageous and dangerous provision. This rule would allow any administration of either party to use the IRS to censor and suppress groups whose ideas the party in power opposes. If the administration in power doesn't like the positions that your organization champions, say goodbye to your hopes for tax-exempt status. The Obama IRS scandals could look tame compared to the kind of political weaponization of the IRS that could occur under H.R. 1.

This provision could have real political implications. Selectively granting tax-exempt status could be a means of weakening political opposition. A group that can't get tax-exempt status may be a group that never gets off the ground for financial reasons and, thus, a group that never becomes a significant voice in opposition to policies of the reigning party.

Do you think this is a worst case scenario? Well, let's remember that something like this already happened under the Obama administration. The IRS was weaponized once, and it can be weaponized again, especially if Democrats succeed in their efforts to eliminate safeguards against such abuse.

And, of course, if the President has his way, the IRS may soon be swimming in money that would substantially increase its reach. President Biden wants to provide the IRS with—get this—an additional $80 billion over 10 years. That would give the IRS a larger budget than the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and other significant government Agencies. It would allow the IRS to hire nearly 87,000 new employees—87,000. All told, the Biden plan would double the number of IRS employees over the next decade.

Now, the reason President Biden gives for this massive increase in IRS funding is increased enforcement efforts in order to close the tax gap—that gap that exists between taxes owed and what Americans end up actually paying. But there is little reason to believe that the IRS will come anywhere close to recovering the amount of money the President claims it can recover, even with a massive infusion of cash. And there is reason to be seriously concerned about what that massive infusion of cash, plus new reporting requirements on Americans' bank and Venmo accounts, could mean for IRS intrusion into Americans' lives.

President Biden, of course, also claims that any increased enforcement will be targeted against wealthy Americans. In what is becoming a typical Democrat class-warfare rhetoric, the President states that ordinary Americans pay their taxes while some wealthy Americans dodge them. Of course, according to the IRS, our Nation has a relatively high and stable voluntary tax compliance rate, and tax compliance levels remain largely unchanged since at least the 1980s. And, in fact, failure to pay tax owed occurs among all kinds of taxpayers in every place along the income spectrum. But the White House isn't letting those facts interfere with its class-warfare rhetoric.

What is more, what guarantees will we have other than Democrats' say-so at this point that this infusion of money will be restricted to combating

tax evasion? As far as I can tell, there is nothing to prevent the new agents the IRS will hire from being retasked at some point to other priorities, like investigating the views of conservative organizations before deciding whether or not to grant them tax-exempt status.

Closing the tax gap is a serious goal that deserves serious discussion, and it is possible that a targeted IRS funding increase for that purpose would be worth considering. But $80 billion is a ridiculous number. In the words of one of President Obama's IRS chiefs: ''I'm not sure you'd be able to efficiently use that much money.''

And any plus-up in funding for the IRS should be accompanied by serious reforms, as well as many protections—not fewer protections—against IRS politicization.

While the Obama IRS scandal represents one of the more egregious abuses of the Agency's power, the IRS is well known for serial mismanagement, like Americans' inability to actually get through to the IRS with their questions.

The Washington Post reported in April that if you were calling the IRS this tax season, you had a 1-in-50—1-in-50—chance of actually getting to speak to a human being.

In May, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration released a report on the 2021 filing season, which noted the IRS struggled to get new hires squared away on the job partially because it is—and here, I am going to have to quote from this report—''difficult to find working copiers . . . to be able to prepare training packages for new hires.'' That is right. And I wish those were the only Agency printer or copier problems, but they are not.

Let me quote from the inspector general's report again.

> Audit teams continue to perform onsite walkthroughs at the Ogden, Utah, and Kansas City, Missouri, Tax Processing Centers to meet with staff to discuss challenges they are facing as it relates to addressing the ongoing backlogs of inventory. A major concern that surfaced during these walkthroughs was a lack of working printers and copiers. IRS management estimated that, as of March 30, 2021, 69 [or] (42 percent) of 164 devices used by the Submission Processing functions are unusable and others are broken but still functioning. IRS employees stated that the only reason they could not use many of these devices is because they are out of ink or because the waste cartridge container is full.

That is from the inspector general's report. I wish this were a joke, but that is straight out of the IG's report.

Hearing that, you might think that we don't need to worry about the weaponization of the IRS because the Agency isn't capable of work that sophisticated. But, as we know, that isn't true. The IRS was successfully weaponized for political purposes during the Obama administration, and the same thing could happen again, especially if Democrats succeed in removing protections against IRS abuse.

As our Nation's revenue-collecting Agency, the IRS is an Agency with immense power, and it is not a voluntary government program. Americans don't get to choose whether or not they interact with the IRS. For that reason, it is vital that there be as many safeguards in place as possible to prevent the IRS from abusing its power or being used for political purposes.

We have seen plenty of evidence that the IRS often doesn't use the money or resources that it currently has in a responsible way. And any increase in money for the IRS—which it certainly should not be anywhere close to $80 billion—should be matched with significant reforms and increased accountability.

And H.R. 1, with its multitude of unwise and unconstitutional provisions even beyond the alarming provisions I have discussed today, must be stopped. Otherwise, the Biden legacy may be the weaponization of the IRS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator from New Jersey.

NOMINATION OF KRISTEN M. CLARKE

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, it is a real honor to be rising today to speak in advance of the vote on Kristen Clarke's nomination to serve as the Attorney General of the Department of Justice.

If she is confirmed, Kristen Clarke will be tasked with overseeing the Justice Department's work to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

I have known Kristen Clarke for years. I have worked with her. I know her, and I can tell you that there can be no one better for this job.

To say that Kristen Clarke has an impressive resume is a gross understatement. She started her career at the Justice Department in the Civil Rights Division. She worked with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. She led the Civil Rights Bureau for the State of New York Attorney General's Office and most recently served as president and executive director of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.

No one could blame Kristen Clarke, after this entire career of service and all that she has given, if she decided to take a step back and find a less demanding job, perhaps a far more lucrative job. But Ms. Clarke has dedicated herself to the highest principles of our Nation—indeed, to the founding ideals of our country, formed with the Bill of Rights, focusing on this idea of civil rights for all.

This is not just her job. This has been her calling. This is her consistent conviction—to serve, to sacrifice for our Nation's most sacrosanct ideals.

She has chosen to serve this country now at a time when we need her leadership more than ever. She is an asset to our country, and I believe she will serve with extraordinary distinction as a guardian of our civil rights.

We need her experience. We need her expertise. We need her heart, her commitment, her deep thoughtfulness.

She is the daughter of immigrants, and after growing up in public housing, in a low-income household, Ms. Clarke made it to some of our most prestigious institutions and made it her cause to make the best out of herself. She is an incredible success story. She is a person who has overcome tremendous odds and advanced herself, not just for personal excellence but for public service. This makes her, in my book, a champion.

Yet there are still those in this confirmation process who want to say that Ms. Clarke is the wrong person for the job. They are actually using smear tactics and lies to try to misrepresent who Ms. Clarke is as a person. There is a saying, ''Let the work I have done speak for me,'' and I wish folk would listen.

She has prosecuted hate crimes. She has defended people's voting rights. She has fought against religious discrimination. She has dedicated her career to the cause of equal justice under law.

Ms. Clarke is the right person for this job. She is exactly who we need. At a time when we are confronting rising hate crimes in America, dramatically more instances of vandalism and violence against Asian Americans, against Jewish Americans, against transgender Americans, we need someone leading the Civil Rights Division who will stand up for all Americans, who has experience prosecuting hate crimes and makes it clear in this Nation that all are created equal and endowed by their Creator with fundamental civil rights. That is who she is now and who she has been for her entire career.

There are folks and forces working to strip away and weaken and undermine these fundamental rights. We see efforts to weaken our democracy, to threaten our principles. We need someone who will stand up and affirm who we are as a people—a nation that believes in robust voting rights, a nation that believes in the equal dignity of all people, a nation that believes in protecting religious liberty. We need a champion now as much as ever. We need Kristen Clarke leading the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice.

And it is not just me saying that. It is just not Democrats saying that. There are over 70 bipartisan former State attorneys general. We see police leaders, law enforcement leaders endorsing her, prosecutors endorsing her, the Anti-Defamation League and 69 different local, State, and national Jewish organizations, all agreeing that Kristen Clarke is the right person to stand for us, to work for us, to fight for us, to champion for our precious civil rights at the Department of Justice.

So many different individuals from all across the political landscape, from all different backgrounds, and so many organizations representing all of our diversity are speaking out in a chorus of conviction about not just how good

Kristen Clarke is but how urgent her nomination is because of who she has shown herself to be time and again: an unassailable, impressive career of service, service, service. She is and has been a servant leader for all of her career; a person of profound integrity; someone whose passion, whose sacrifice, whose struggle in the pursuit of justice has already made this Nation better.

I will say something on a personal note in closing. I have worked with Kristen Clarke for years now on things that we have done together, like a bipartisan criminal justice reform bill.

I had the occasion years ago of meeting her when she was out in Washington with her son. He was a young guy, not that tall. Then, during her hearings in the Judiciary Committee, I saw her again present herself in an extraordinarily powerful manner, with grace and expertise, but I saw that young man now had grown up. He is a big guy. And it would be a leap of ego for me to say that I saw myself in this young man because he is probably a lot smarter than I was when I was his age and clearly is a better athlete, even though I will say for the record that the older I get, the better I am in sports.

But I think about her career, and then I align it to what she has done in raising a young Black man in America. While I couldn't project myself onto him, I thought a lot about my mom in her. My mom raised my brother and me in a nation that strove to be who we say we are, a nation of liberty and justice for all. But where she knew we were falling short, she didn't raise us to be bitter; she raised us to be better. She raised us by setting an example, a woman who—from sitting in at a lunch counter to desegregate a restaurant, to helping organize the March on Washington, she showed me by example. As James Baldwin has said, children are never good at listening to their elders, but they never fail to imitate them.

I want you all to know that in Kristen Clarke, we have an extraordinary American, an extraordinary person, and a great mom. And I know what she has done with her life. She has lived perhaps with the greatest principle of all, which is for us in this generation to make a better way for the next, for us to make a more perfect Union, for us to understand that the arc of the moral universe is indeed long but we must bend it more towards justice.

I tell my colleagues and urge you to confirm her to this sacrosanct and urgent position today because I am confident to the core of my being that she will not just make us proud, she will not just defend those who are having their rights trampled or their dignity marginalized, but that she will make a better way for an America that fulfills its promise, still not yet achieved, for us to be a nation with liberty and justice for all.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, here we go again. Just a few weeks ago, the Senate debated Vanita Gupta's nomination for Associate Attorney General, so let's review the bidding from that.

Gupta was eminently qualified for her role. She had support from the foremost law enforcement leaders and groups in the country. She had proven herself handling high-level government responsibilities. But Republicans set their hair on fire trying to take Ms. Gupta down. They grasped for something, anything, to dent her prospects. Eventually they landed on contorting an 8-year-old op-ed, even calling her accurate responses to their questions about it lies. It wasn't pretty.

Now we are back on the floor with Republican hair aflame again, this time over the nominee to run the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, Kristen Clarke. Like Ms. Gupta, Ms. Clarke is eminently qualified. She knows civil rights law inside and out. She has run one of the Nation's leading civil rights organizations. She is a superb, well-trained, experienced lawyer.

Conservatives have endorsed her, like President George W. Bush's DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff and former Republican National Committee Chairman Michael Steele. Law enforcement organizations like the Major Cities Chiefs Association and the International Association of Chiefs of Police support her.

She ought to have flown through committee and been a quick vote here on the floor, but, no, it is hair-on-fire time again. Why all the coifs aflame? Look behind the smokescreens and remember that the No. 1 strategy of the Republican Party for 2022 is to keep voters from voting. And guess what. Ms. Clarke will run the voting rights section of the Department, and Ms. Gupta, who used to run that same Civil Rights Division, will supervise her as Assistant Attorney General.

Behind the ruckus over Ms. Gupta and now Ms. Clarke is a dark money operation out to suppress the vote. It has the trade craft of a covert operation—cutouts, front groups, secret money—and that covert operation is now focused on preventing, as our colleague Senator WARNOCK says, ''some people'' from voting. And Ms. Clarke and Ms. Gupta will be the lawful, legal opposition to the dark money, voter-suppression apparatus.

Here is what we know. When Trump was in power, this covert op ran a dark money-funded apparatus within the Federalist Society to select Federal judges. For 4 years, the Federalist Society's operation was the gatekeeper to the Federal bench. Virtually every judicial candidate who passed through this dark money-funded turnstile was approved by big, anonymous donors out to control the courts. Donors got to approve judges and Justices who would have their backs.

That dark money turnstile was step 1. Step 2 was dark money-funded political campaigns for Senate confirmation of the nominees who got through the turnstile. For Trump's three Supreme Court nominees, this was done by the Judicial Crisis Network, headquartered literally down the hall from the Federalist Society—not just the same building, the same hallway, but they also share staff. In each Supreme Court confirmation, a $15 million or a $17 million check from a secret donor would fund the advertising campaign.

Step 3 is dark money-funded front organizations appearing before the donor-selected Justices in orchestrated flotillas with common donors behind them, undisclosed to the Court.

When Trump lost, of course, step 1 and step 2 lost their salience and closed up shop. But with Trump judges still on the court, these front groups are still at it. In one case before the Supreme Court right now, 50 organizations—50 organizations—that filed briefs received funding through right-wing groups involved in this operation.

Dark money funding can't be traced back to its original donors, obviously, because it is dark money, but a 2019 Washington Post investigation revealed that one guy, Leonard Leo, while executive vice president of the Federalist Society, from 2014 to 2017 coordinated $250 million—a quarter of a billion dollars—across a network of the front groups engaged in this court capture operation. Recent testimony in my Courts Subcommittee raised that number to over $400 million—nearly half a billion dollars—through 2018. Four hundred million is a lot of money, but a captured court, that is a pearl beyond price.

This Leo operation worked wonderfully during the Trump Presidency. Donors got their judges. Judicial Crisis Network and Leonard Leo got their dark money. But then that Post investigation came out, and Trump's polling started to tank. So, like a burned agent, Leonard Leo bugged out.

Where did he bug out to? Well, Leo surfaced early last year with a group called the Honest Elections Project. These phony-baloney front groups love to have the name that is the exact opposite of what they are actually doing. So this one is called the Honest Elections Project, and it has been running voter suppression activities in key battleground States, sending threatening letters to local election officials, and filing lawsuits to restrict voting—and, of course, all dark money-funded.

But poke a little further and you discover that the Honest Elections Project is a legal alias of something called the Judicial Education Project, which is—you guessed it—the sister group to Judicial Crisis Network—yep, Leo's judicial confirmation attack-ad organization. And, of course, behind this covert op was dark money, much of it run through DonorsTrust, the identity-laundering, dark money ATM established by the Kochs' donor network. Before it took on this Honest

Elections Project alias, more than 99 percent of the Judicial Education Project's 2018 revenue was a single, anonymous $7.8 million donation that came through, of course, DonorsTrust. There is no way to know who cut that check.

What does all this dark money finagling and front group subterfuge tell us? As a reporter for the Guardian observed, the Honest Elections Project, so-called, melds two goals of the right-wing dark money operation: One, pack the Federal judiciary, and two, bring voting rights cases before the packed courts. Rigging elections by keeping ''some people'' from voting is now a Republican priority, and if Trump judges will help, so much the better.

Just recently, we actually learned more about the covert voter suppression operation. The watchdog group Documented and the magazine Mother Jones uncovered a video of a presentation by the dark money group Heritage Action to its top donors. In the video, the presenter brags about getting what she called ''key provisions''—''key provisions''—into voter suppression legislation in dozens of capitals around the country.

She tells the donors, and I am quoting here, ''In some cases, we actually draft them for them''—they actually draft the laws for the State legislatures—''or,'' she said, ''we have a sentinel''—a sentinel; what a creepy word—''we have a sentinel on our behalf give them the model legislation so it has that grassroots, from-the-bottom-up type of vibe.'' Big donors love that grassroots, from-the-bottom-up type of vibe.

There is lots of dark money that fuels this covert op. Heritage Action says it plans to spend $24 million in eight battleground States to ''create an echo chamber'' of relentless lobbying for voter suppression bills. They say they will be coordinating with known Koch network groups like the Susan B. Anthony List, Tea Party Patriots, and FreedomWorks.

This operation is the kind of stuff that we might want our intelligence services to do in enemy countries to create disruption and discord and provide secret influence. The idea that creepy billionaires are running covert operations in and against our own country, that ought to make you cringe.

Not only is this behavior morally corrupt, it may have broken rules. One State legislature has already floated an ethics probe into Heritage Action's sentinels jamming phony bills through their chamber.

So back to Senate Republicans getting their hair on fire over Kristen Clarke and Vanita Gupta. These two women scare the daylights out of this dark money operation behind Republican voter suppression. Ms. Clarke knows the Voting Rights Act cold; she won voting rights cases against voter suppression laws all over the country. Put Jim Crow 2.0 up against a Department of Justice Civil Rights Division led by Kristen Clarke, and that dark money voter suppression operation has a problem. So the big dark money donors behind this covert operation will raise whatever ruckus they can—first, to try to stop Vanita Gupta, which didn't work, and now to stop Kristen Clarke, which won't work—all in an effort to protect their dark money scheme to prevent some people from voting. You have to look behind the smokescreen sometimes to understand what is going on. It is not pretty, but it is the truth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to conclude my remarks before the vote begins.

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

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, about 50 years ago, William Proxmire rose in this esteemed body and told us about government waste. He called it the Golden Fleece Award. They were studying things like dating and love and what makes love, and we had these great scientific studies about love. These are William Proxmire's words from the early 1970s. He was a conservative Democrat.

He says:

> I object to this [study on love] because no one—not even the National Science Foundation—can argue that falling in love is a science; not only because I'm sure that even if they spend $84 million or $84 billion they wouldn't get an answer that anyone would believe. I'm also against [this study on love] because I don't want the answer.
>
> I believe that 200 million other Americans want to leave some things in life a mystery, and right at the top of things we don't [need] to know is why a man falls in love with a woman and vice versa.

Stirring words. The Golden Fleece Award—I remember as a kid everybody talked about it. It was in the newspapers. So what have we done to curb the wasteful appetite, the abuse of government that has happened at the National Science Foundation since 1972? Not a damn thing.

Here is one of my other favorites from William Proxmire's days. The FAA was named for spending $57,000 on a study of the physical measurements of 432 airline stewardesses. These included the distance from knee to knee while sitting and the length of the buttocks. Fifty-eight thousand dollars—this was your government money being put to good use.

So fast forward, and we spend about $8 billion a year with the National Science Foundation. Is it getting any better? Are they doing a better job at overseeing their money? Well, I don't know. This bill is going to increase their funding by 68 percent. There is $29 billion in this bill for the National Science Foundation. So don't you think the American people deserve to know where their money is being spent?

This was from their sister Agency, the NIH, but you know we can't get started without talking about it. This is over $800,000 to study whether or not Japanese quail are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine. I am not making this up—$800,000 of taxpayer money to study whether Japanese quail are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine.

Do you think we could have just polled the audience? Do you think we could have just said: What do you think? Because that is sort of the answer. The answer is yes. And yet your government spent 800 grand on that. And then when we pointed it out 5 years ago, did they do anything to reform it? No. They are here today to give the Agencies that are doing this research more money.

Another one that I think is quite revealing is this study that is about Panamanian male frog calls. You have about half a million dollars, and they wanted to know whether or not the male mating call is different in the country than it is in the city.

Now, coming from a rural State like Kentucky, I can tell you the male mating call is different in the country than it is in the city. But nobody in Kentucky wants a half a million dollars spent on a Panamanian frog's male mating call. This is not a good use of money.

So if someone told you your government was spending this money, would you give them more? Would you give the Agency more if they were doing this or less? I think less.

In looking at the National Science Foundation's spending, we also found that they spent $30,000 studying Ugandan gambling habits. Really? We are studying why people gamble in Uganda, why there is a black market in Uganda. Well, do you know what? I think we know the reason. When government oppresses business and regulates business to death, they go to the black market. If you make something illegal, you often get more of it. But we spent $30,000 traveling over to Uganda to study their gambling habits—utter waste of money. We should not reward these people with more money.

We spent about half a million on a video game. This is an app for your phone. I know we all need things to do when we should be working or at school. This is an app for schoolchildren to teach them alarmism over climate change. So you can click on the app, and it will scare you to death that California is going to be underwater in 100 years—none of which is true, all of which is alarmism, and a half a million dollars spent by the government to alarm our schoolchildren is not a good idea.

This next study points out a problem with funding, in general, in our government. You give funds for something that ostensibly might be a good cause. So a couple of years ago, they gave money for autism—$700,000 for autism. And you think, well, autism, you know, even myself, as conservative as I am, I

can probably say, well, that is something we ought to study, autism. Well, they subcontracted 700 grand of it to a bunch of egghead researchers to watch Neil Armstrong's statement on the Moon. Do you remember the black-and-white photo? He is on the Moon, and he says, ''[O]ne small step for man, one giant leap for mankind,'' or did he really say: One small step for a man?

So these researchers took $700,000 to listen to that crackly old cassette recording and find out, did he say ''man'' or did he say ''a man''? So we studied the preposition ''a,'' and we spent 700 grand listening to the tape over and over and over again. And do you know what they determined? They just can't decide. They are unsure, but they did recommend more money to study the problem further.

This is insulting to the American taxpayer. We should not be giving these people more money; we should be giving them dramatically less money.

But it also points out one of the reforms that I have proposed for this Agency. One of the problems with the National Science Foundation is, if I want to do research on Japanese quail snorting cocaine, guess what, I can ask for the same people who are studying snorting cocaine in animals—I can ask them to be on my peer committee. I can choose the people on my peer committee. So if I want to study animals snorting cocaine, I pick other researchers who are studying animals snorting cocaine. Guess what. They tend to say yes. If they say yes, the scientist gets on the next peer Commission, and he says or she says yes for their snorting cocaine research.

This is crazy. We should not let these so-called scientists pick who is on their committee. Not only that, I think we ought to have a taxpayer advocate. Could we not have just someone with a good dose of common sense who says we shouldn't take autism money, steal it, and spend it on a bunch of idiots listening to what Neil Armstrong said when he landed on the Moon? So that is part of the reform we should have.

One of my other alltime favorites from the National Science Foundation—this kind of goes back to William Proxmire and love and happiness—they wanted to know if you take a selfie of yourself while smiling and you look at it later in the day, will that make you happy?

Really? That is a half a million dollars. I don't think we need a scientist to say that that is BS and that government has got no business doing this kind of research. I don't even know how you could even call this research with a straight face. But it goes on year on, year on. We have been complaining about this since 1972, so you would think maybe we would have less of it. We are giving them more money. So we are now increasing their budget by 68 percent despite this kind of research.

The last one I have is this. We spent $1.3 million on insect ranching. This is money that was sent to study whether or not we could put insects into animal feed. We spent another $3 million, though, wanting to know if humans would eat ants to prevent climate change.

What will you do, America, to combat climate change? Will you eat ants to combat climate change? That was a study. This is not science. This is ridiculous in nature.

Actually, I lied. I have got one more example. We spent $1.5 million studying lizards on a treadmill. So I know you have all been curious, when lizards walk and they kind of waddle and they have a funny walk, why do they walk that way? What is going on in their knee joints? What do their hip joints look like when they waddle across the lawn? Everybody wants to know that, but are you willing to spend $1.5 million of your taxpayer dollars to take x rays—live, real-time x rays—of a lizard walking on a treadmill? I tend to think, you know, maybe Alzheimer's research, maybe cancer research, maybe heart research. But spending good, hard cash on x rays of a lizard on a treadmill does not strike me as the most pressing concerns of government.

I would argue that instead of increasing their money, we should be decreasing their money. We also need to have oversight on where our money is being spent. There is a great deal of circumstantial evidence now that NIH money went to the Wuhan Institute of Virology. There is a great deal of evidence at least suggesting that the pandemic may have started there. We don't know for certain. I am not saying that it did, but there is evidence now that suggests that it might have. No. 1, there is no animal host for COVID–19. We have not found—of the thousands of animals we tested in the wet market, none of them had COVID–19. When you take COVID–19 and you try to infect bats, which is where most coronaviruses come from, what do you discover? You discover that COVID–19 is actually not very well infected in bats. The bats don't catch it very easily. It seems as if COVID–19 is most adaptive for humans. But if it came from animals, shouldn't there be an animal host that is readily infected by this?

The other evidence we have in the last couple of days is confirmation that three individuals at the Wuhan Institute got sick in November of last year, sick enough to be in the hospital from a virus that was previously undisclosed. They worked in the Wuhan Institute. We are told this came from the wet market lab from exotic animals, but not one animal tested positive for the virus.

We have an amendment we are hoping will be adopted by this body that says gain-of-function research, as defined by the NIH in 2014, will not be permitted in China. We will not fund it with American dollars.

But it is like so much waste in government, I think there is no reason to be sending any money to China for research. They are a rich country. For goodness' sake, we are worried about them outcompeting us, stealing our intellectual property, and then we send them millions of dollars to do research. Why don't they spend their own money? Do we trust them enough? Are they open enough to tell us what is going on in the lab that we want to give them money?

I think, without question, they have not shown this, and now we are finding out that people were sick in the lab in November.

No more money should go to China for research on gain of function, which means increasing the virulence or pathogenicity or the transmissibility of COVID virus to humans. I urge this body to adopt my amendment, which says, from here on out, China doesn't get any money to create superviruses in a lab, and we should continue to investigate this because 3 million people have died worldwide. We have disrupted the entire world's economy over a virus. If it came from a lab, we need to know it, and it needs to be fully investigated.

VOTE ON BROOKS-LASURE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brooks-LaSure nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 201 Ex.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Ernst	Lummis
Blackburn	Fischer	Marshall
Boozman	Graham	McConnell
Braun	Grassley	Paul
Capito	Hagerty	Portman
Cassidy	Hawley	Risch
Cornyn	Hoeven	Romney
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cramer	Inhofe	Rubio
Crapo	Johnson	Sasse
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Daines	Lee	Scott (SC)

Shelby	Tillis	Wicker
Sullivan	Toomey	Young
Thune	Tuberville	

NOT VOTING—1

Kennedy

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, are we now moving to a cloture vote on Kristen Clarke?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have the cloture vote next.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes equally divided for debate in support and opposition to Ms. Clarke.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF KRISTEN M. CLARKE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is significant that on this day, this anniversary of the death of George Floyd, that we are considering one of the key appointments in the Biden administration to be Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider the historic importance of this moment and to support this well-deserving and experienced person to serve our Nation in this capacity. I urge my colleagues to vote aye.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Hearing none, all time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 124, Kristen M. Clarke, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Jacky Rosen, Richard Blumenthal, Tina Smith, John W. Hickenlooper, Michael F. Bennet, Tim Kaine, Brian Schatz.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kristen M. Clarke, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—48

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

NOT VOTING—1

Kennedy

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 48.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Kristen M. Clarke, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:03 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

NOMINATION OF KRISTEN M. CLARKE

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, today the Senate will vote on Kristen Clarke's nomination to head the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division—one of the most powerful positions at the Department of Justice. I will, of course, oppose her nomination.

We get a lot of partisan nominees around here. So that is not very surprising. But Ms. Clarke isn't just partisan. She is extremely partisan. She called Senator MURKOWSKI ''shameful.'' She accused Senator MANCHIN of being disingenuous. And she casually slandered 200—200—sitting, Senate-confirmed judges as ''white male extremists.'' If confirmed for this position, she will be entrusted with representing the U.S. Government in front of those very judges—not exactly a credible advocate for our people, if you ask me.

Ms. Clarke's radicalism doesn't stop with ad hominem insults. It thoroughly infects her professional judgment as well. Ms. Clarke has consistently demonstrated that she is more interested in attacking police and calling everybody a racist than finding the facts or reviewing the evidence.

When it comes to racially incendiary cases, she proudly fans the flames of division. Last year, she repeatedly—repeatedly—spread the falsehood that Jacob Blake, who had a knife and was actively resisting arrest, was, in fact, ''unarmed'' when he was shot by the police. In part because of falsehoods like that one, riots engulfed the city of Kenosha, WI.

She also claimed that Officer Darren Wilson, who shot and killed Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO, was only exonerated ''based on racism.'' When I asked Ms. Clarke if she had reconsidered that unsubstantiated opinion, she pretended not to know enough to answer the question, at first, which is remarkable given that the shooting in Ferguson is one of the most publicized and explosive cases in recent years; also remarkable because she apparently knew enough to tar a grand jury of normal American citizens as yes, once again, racist, but not enough to answer simple questions.

Ms. Clarke's opinion on the Ferguson case sets her apart from other staunch liberals like Vanita Gupta and Eric Holder. Both have acknowledged that Officer Wilson was justified in the use of force, echoing the Obama Department of Justice, which came to the very same conclusion. In defiance of all evidence, in spite of her good friend Ms. Gupta's views, Ms. Clarke still dissents from this conclusion. So I cannot believe it—I am genuinely astonished—but Joe Biden has somehow found a nominee more radical than Vanita Gupta. That is an impressive accomplishment, one that should give Senators who supported Ms. Gupta more than ample ground to oppose Ms. Clarke.

Moreover, Ms. Clarke is a firm and, until very recently, a vocal supporter of defunding the police. Ms. Clarke wrote an article less than a year ago—not some college paper. Less than a year ago, Ms. Clarke wrote an article with ''Defund the Police'' in the title. She stated: ''Must invest less in police'' three times in the text of that article. She also wrote: ''I advocate for defunding policing operations.''

I don't know. Call me naive. Call me simple. When you write an article entitled ''Defund the Police'' and when you say, ''[W]e must invest less in the police'' and ''I advocate for defunding policing options,'' it sounds to me like you support defunding the police. But, apparently, I am wrong about that because when she was asked about this at her hearing, Ms. Clarke denied—amazingly, denied—that she supported defunding the police. She claimed that when she wrote that ''we should defund the police,'' she actually meant that we should not defund the police. Astoundingly, she blamed an editor for coming up with the title to her piece but conveniently can't recall what an alternative title she suggested would have been or whether she objected to a title that was apparently the exact opposite of what she intended.

Now, maybe this shouldn't be surprising. After all, her article title was ''I prosecuted police killings. Defund the Police—but be Strategic.'' Apparently, the strategy is lying, because that is what we saw at our committee.

We said: Ms. Clarke, the title of your article is ''Defund the Police.''

Like, I didn't choose the title.

Ms. Clarke, you wrote three times in the story ''defund the police.''

She is like: I don't support defunding the police.

But, Ms. Clarke, you wrote here, as well, that we should invest less in the police.

She is like: No, I don't think we should invest less; we should invest more.

The old argument: It is not my dog. It didn't bite you. You kicked him first.

Regardless of what she and her defenders might say, one thing is crystal clear: A vote for Kristen Clarke is a vote to defund the police.

Finally, not surprisingly, we come to Ms. Clarke's consistent dishonesty, duplicity, and evasion throughout her hearing and written statements. In one particularly bizarre incident, Ms. Clarke claimed in her hearing that she was proud to have the endorsement of the National Association of Police Organizations, a group which represents nearly a quarter million law enforcement officers.

Now that would be big news, a huge endorsement. So I asked my staff to get me a copy of the endorsement letter. It turns out they couldn't because it doesn't exist.

Now, that is not good, but people misspeak all the time, especially when under pressure. So I wanted to give Ms. Clarke a chance to correct the record. I asked for clarity in a written question. Thankfully, Ms. Clarke responded that she had misstated the facts.

OK. That is fine, I accept that explanation. Again, people misspeak. No one is perfect. Yet imagine my surprise when I received an answer to another written question that claimed almost verbatim the same thing she had said in her hearing—that she was endorsed by this organization.

She similarly responded to at least three other Senators that she was endorsed by this organization, even after admitting just a few pages earlier in her written answers that she had misstated that she had such an endorsement. At that point, that is not a simple mistake. It is not misspeaking. It is not a fib. It is totally and completely untrue in written testimony to the U.S. Congress. Yet she has not apologized. She has not acknowledged this blatant lie.

This episode sadly proves that she lacks the transparency and honesty to be trusted in such an important position.

You know, my Democratic colleagues have, for the last 4 years, endlessly lectured about the need for the Department of Justice to be free from partisan politics and for it to be run by serious, competent individuals. They seems to have a slightly different view today. From her extremism to her lack of candor, Ms. Clarke is unfit to lead any organization in the Department of Justice—indeed, simply to serve the Department of Justice. If the Democratic Senators vote to confirm Ms. Clarke, they will be responsible for every battle she wages in Joe Biden's war on the police, and I will make sure that their voters know about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes before the rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it was 1 year ago today. It was a street corner in the city of Minneapolis, the corner of 38th and Chicago Avenue. For 9 minutes and 29 seconds, Derek Chauvin, a Minneapolis policeman, knelt on George Floyd's neck. As he knelt on his neck, he stared into a camera with a look that haunts me to this day. Those 9 minutes and 29 seconds took George Floyd's life and changed America's national conversation about law enforcement. Those 9 minutes and 29 seconds sparked a global movement and compelled us to bear witness to the reality of racial injustice in our country.

In this Senate we are in a privileged position to face that reality and to continue America's long, sometimes bitter march toward equal justice under the law. That is why I rise today in support of Kristen Clarke's nomination to be Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

It is worth noting the history of this position. The Civil Rights Division is one of the most important components of the Justice Department. The Attorney General's Office has existed since 1789. The Justice Department itself was not created until after our Civil War.

During the days of Reconstruction, after that war, our Nation resolved to take new steps to form a more perfect Union through the 13th Amendment's abolishing slavery, the 14th Amendment's guarantee of due process and equal protection, and the 15th Amendment's protection of all citizens' fundamental right to vote.

The Department of Justice was created after the passage of those amendments and entrusted with the responsibility to defend the rights of Americans, particularly the newly emancipated, formerly enslaved Americans.

Given the Department's immediate imperative to protect and preserve civil rights, President Ulysses S. Grant appointed Amos Akerman to be the first Attorney General to lead this new Department. Why? He had extensive experience in prosecuting voter intimidation as the U.S. attorney in the State of Georgia.

More than 150 years later, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department now is entrusted with that constitutional responsibility. The Division enforces Federal statutes prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, religion, national origin, and citizenship status.

And just as President Grant appointed a legal expert with a breadth of experience to lead the newly formed Justice Department in 1870, today, President Joe Biden has chosen Kristen Clarke to take up the mantle as the head of the Civil Rights Division. With her breadth of experience defending the civil rights of all Americans, Kristen Clarke is singularly qualified to lead this Division, particularly at this moment in history.

Kristen Clarke will be the first Senate confirmed woman of color to do so—the first.

When I listen to the caricatures that are portrayed on the floor of the Senate about this woman, I find it hard to believe they are talking about the Kristen Clarke that we met in open Senate hearings.

We know what happened to the Civil Rights Division under President Trump. Under President Trump and Attorneys General Sessions and Barr, the Civil Rights Division was devastated. Over the past 4 years, the Division rescinded guidance protecting transgender students, prohibited the use of consent decrees for local police departments that had engaged in systemic misconduct, and abandoned the prior legal positions supporting Americans' fundamental right to vote.

I believe America needs a Civil Rights Division that vigorously defends the civil rights of all Americans. Kristen Clarke is the legal expert we need to restore and reinvigorate the Civil Rights Division.

You wouldn't know it from the characterizations on the other side about her experience, but, notably, she is a veteran of two of its sections. She began her legal career defending voting rights in the Voting Section and later prosecuted hate crimes in the Division's Criminal Section. She personally

understands the key role the Division's line attorneys play in protecting civil rights.

Since leaving the Civil Rights Division, Ms. Clarke has continued defending civil rights in State government and national civil rights organizations. First, Ms. Clarke co-led the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund's voting rights work, litigating voting rights cases under the Voting Rights Act and the National Voter Registration Act. Then she served as a civil rights official for the New York State Attorney General's Office, where she played a key role in launching a religious rights initiative to address faith-based discrimination.

When you listen to those assignments and the fact that this woman was chosen to head these divisions, how can it possibly square with some of the caricatures that have been drawn on the floor today about who she is?

Most recently, Ms. Clarke was chosen to lead the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. Those of us who follow this closely know it is one of the most preeminent civil rights groups in America. During her tenure, the Lawyers' Committee has taken on a huge caseload and doubled in size to address the most pressing civil rights issues of our time, including hate crimes.

Here is the part that I want to make a special emphasis on. Both Vanita Gupta and Kristen Clarke have extensive endorsements from law enforcement organizations. Yet, when they were characterized on the floor of the Senate by their critics, they were characterized as haters of police and law enforcement. It just mystifies me how Senators can come to the floor knowing these organizations and believe that these two women have hoodwinked them into believing that they support law enforcement. The women and men in law enforcement aren't pushed around and aren't easily deceived. They have endorsed these two women, and today we address Kristen Clarke's nomination because of the records they have written, not over a period of days or weeks or months but years and in some cases decades, that they have written.

Consider this statement from Sheriff David Mahoney from Dane County, WI, recently stepped down from the National Sheriffs' Association.

Let me quickly add, the National Sheriffs' Association is a powerful organization, and it is one that isn't pushed around by any politicians.

Sheriff Mahoney wrote—and I want to quote his words after some of the outrageous charges that have been made against Ms. Clarke this afternoon. Sheriff Mahoney wrote: ''Building trust between law enforcement and communities is essential for law enforcement to effectively serve all members of our community. It is with this in mind that I strongly support Kristen Clarke. Ms. Clarke has built trust in every stage of her career.''

Does that sound like someone who wants to defund the police? Do you think that this Sheriff Mahoney from Dane County in Wisconsin would say that about someone who wants to defund police?

He went on to say: ''When she was a federal prosecutor as a young attorney, she gained the trust of federal agents and domestic violence survivors and crime victims. When she was the Chief of the Civil Rights Bureau in the New York State Attorney General's office, she built trust among New Yorkers to protect their rights, and with the Lawyers' Committee, she gained the trust of hate crimes victims and survivors.''

She has so many endorsements from law enforcement groups and from prosecutors. I am not going to read them all into the RECORD.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have letters of support for Ms. Clarke printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF BLACK LAW ENFORCEMENT EXECUTIVES,
January 30, 2021.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD J. DURBIN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCHELL MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER SCHUMER, MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, CHAIRMAN DURBIN, AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: The National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE) formally acknowledges the work and commitment to service that has been exhibited by Ms. Kristen Clarke. She is a long-time partner of NOBLE and the recipient of our 2016 Civil Rights Justice by Action Award.

Ms. Clarke has displayed the qualities of leadership, empathy, excellence, and persistence in supporting and defending the U.S. Constitution while ensuring equal protection and justice for all Americans. This has been exhibited countless times in roles such as President of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and Manager of the Civil Rights Bureau of the New York Department of Law.

It is NOBLE's belief that Ms. Clarke will help to ensure the delivery of its mission which is to ensure equity in the administration of justice in the provision of public service to all communities, and to serve as the conscience of law enforcement by being committed to Justice by Action.

In closing, this correspondence acts as a formal endorsement of Ms. Kristen Clarke as the next Head of the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division.

Sincerely,

DWAYNE A. CRAWFORD,
Executive Director.

MAJOR CITIES CHIEFS ASSOCIATION,
February 3, 2021.

Hon. LINDSEY GRAHAM,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRAHAM AND RANKING MEMBER FEINSTEIN: The Major Cities Chiefs Association, a professional organization of police executives representing the largest cities in the United States and Canada, is proud to endorse President Biden's nominations of Lisa Monaco to serve as Deputy Attorney General, Vanita Gupta to serve as Associate Attorney General, and Kristen Clarke to serve as Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

The Department of Justice (DOJ) has been tasked with addressing a complex set of issues, including police reform, criminal justice reform, violent crime, and domestic extremism. The team President Biden has nominated is immensely qualified for this responsibility. The nominees have decades of experience serving in senior leadership roles within DOJ, other elements of the justice system, the private sector, civil rights and civil liberties organizations, and other key stakeholder groups. This experience will be invaluable as they work to tackle the many challenges facing DOJ.

In conversations with MCCA leadership, the nominees listened intently to our concerns and expressed a desire to collaborate closely with the MCCA. They indicated that open lines of communication and MCCA input are critical in addressing shared priorities such as advancing constitutional policing, improving officer health and wellness, and combatting the rise in violent crime currently occurring across the country.

President Biden's DOJ nominees also made it clear that they neither support defunding the police nor believe that doing so will bring about the change our communities are calling for. They pledged to work closely with the MCCA to support and amplify the efforts already underway by many local law enforcement agencies to develop and implement policies and practices that are fair, equitable, transparent, and build trust and legitimacy with all members of the community.

The MCCA believes these nominees will be effective leaders and valuable partners for local law enforcement agencies. On behalf of the MCCA membership, I respectfully request the Committee act swiftly and support the nominations of Ms. Monaco, Ms. Gupta, and Ms. Clarke.

Sincerely,

ART ACEVEDO,
Chief, Houston Police Department, President, Major Cities Chiefs Association.

HISPANIC AMERICAN POLICE COMMAND OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
February 6, 2021.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD J. DURBIN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER SCHUMER, MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, CHAIRMAN DURBIN, AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: The Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association (HAPCOA) wishes to support and recommend the nomination of Ms. Kristin

Clarke to the position of Head of the US Department of Justice Civil Rights Division.

HAPCOA is the oldest and largest association of Hispanic American command officers from law enforcement and criminal justice agencies at the municipal, county, state, school, university and federal levels.

HAPCOA's mission is to ''empower the future of law enforcement'' by assisting law enforcement, criminal justice and community organizations nationwide in their efforts to recruit, train, mentor and promote qualified Hispanic American men and women committed to a career in the criminal justice arena and to the communities in which they serve and protect.

HAPCOA acknowledges the work ethic and commitment of Ms. Clarke and believe that she will be an effective leader as the next Head of the DOJ Civil Rights Division.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY CHAPA,
Executive Director

DANE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE,
April 29, 2021.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD J. DURBIN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER SCHUMER, MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, CHAIRMAN DURBIN AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: I write to express my strong support for Kristen Clarke, the President's nominee to serve as Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division.

I serve as the Sheriff in Dane County, Wisconsin. I was first elected to this position in 2006 and have served four terms in office, and have over 40 years of service in law enforcement. Our office serves the city of Madison, the capital of Wisconsin, and its surrounding cities and towns. I also serve as President of the National Sheriffs' Association, an organization I hold in very high regard.

Building trust between law enforcement and communities is essential for law enforcement to effectively serve all members of our community. This overarching value is a bedrock principle that has guided my stewardship of the Sheriff's office, and is shared by law enforcement leaders all across the country. This bedrock value is also important to federal law enforcement leaders, who partner with state and local law enforcement to promote public safety and build public trust.

It is with this in mind that I strongly support Kristen Clarke, the President's Civil Rights Division nominee. Ms. Clarke has built trust at every stage of her career. When she was a federal prosecutor as a young attorney, she gained the trust of federal agents and domestic violence survivors and crime victims. When she was the Chief of the Civil Rights Bureau in the New York State Attorney General's office, she built trust among New Yorkers to protect their rights to practice their faiths, to allow for language access, and to protect against discrimination at work. When Ms. Clarke left government service to lead the non-profit Lawyers' Committee of Civil Rights Under Law, Ms. Clarke gained the trust of hate crimes victims and survivors, to ensure that they could obtain justice against their perpetrators.

As a tireless advocate for those who have been targeted by inequality, hate, and discrimination, Ms. Clarke is exactly the type of person who should be charged with guarding and enforcing this country's core federal civil rights laws. She is an exemplary lawyer and leader who possesses the character, qualifications, and commitment to lead the Civil Rights Division.

I urge you and your colleagues to support Ms. Clarke's nomination.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVID J. MAHONEY,
Sheriff, Dane County, Wisconsin.

Mr. DURBIN. The point I am trying to make is this: At this moment in history, filling this Division, the Civil Rights Division, on the anniversary of George Floyd's murder on the streets of Minneapolis, we are choosing the first woman of color in the history of the United States to head this Division. It is a historic choice. It shouldn't be trivialized by those who want to paint a caricature of this woman not even close to the truth. It shouldn't be trivialized by ignoring the many endorsements she rightfully received because of her good life's work, having spent her entire career defending the civil rights of all Americans.

Ms. Clarke is the right person for the job. President Joseph Biden believes that. The Attorney General believes it, and I believe it as well. At a time when we have seen an appalling rise in hate crimes, we need someone with her experience to head this Division.

I urge my colleagues to take note of the continued need for the Civil Rights Division to do its important work 150 years after its creation. Given that need and Ms. Clarke's breadth and depth of experience, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of her nomination.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON CLARKE NOMINATION

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

Rollcall Vote No. 203 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—48

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

NOT VOTING—1

Kennedy

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I am here today to talk about the origins of the COVID–19 virus. I want to stop and thank the scientists and journalists who risked and in some instances gave their lives to get the genetic sequence of the virus and some hints of its origin out to the rest of the world to give us a fighting chance.

I also want to thank the NIH and Dr. Francis Collins, whose team was able to stabilize the virus within a matter of weeks and share that technology with the world. This helped to quickly launch the success of Operation Warp Speed, as well as other research for testing, anti-virals, and vaccines.

But now here we are 16 months into the most catastrophic health disaster of our lifetime, and we still have more questions than answers. At least 3 million lives have been claimed by the virus, and we still don't know its origin. More specifically, we don't know its geographical or biological origin. The world deserves to know and needs to know where and how it started. Was it naturally occurring, or was it made in a lab?

I am here today to tell you, the preponderance of evidence suggests that this virus leaked from a lab in Wuhan. But first let's look at the mounting evidence suggesting that COVID–19 is truly a supervirus, the product of lab manipulations, including viral gain of function. In order to do this, we need to look at the world history of two similar events and the great work of scientists surrounding the containment of SARS in 2002 and MERS in 2012.

For SARS, it took 4 months to find an intermediate host, a civet, a raccoon-looking mammal. Yes, it only took 4 months to prove that the SARS virus went from a bat to a civet to a human. Significantly, scientists found 24 viral ancestors to SARS, as the virus

spontaneously mutated from a virus that would not easily attach to human cells into a more lethal virus.

For MERS, it only took 9 months to find the virus occurring naturally in bats, and the intermediate host was camels.

Yet, with COVID–19, here we are some 16 months later, and we have no intermediate host and no COVID–19 found in a live bat. The Chinese tell us they tested over 80,000 viral sequences and have come up empty. Coincidence?

No precursors, no grandfather or great-grandfathers, nothing close to resembling COVID–19 has been found in nature. As a matter of fact, the closest virus we know of to COVID–19 is RaTG13, which has called the Wuhan Institute of Virology home for several years. This virus was supposedly from bats in Yunnan and transported by scientists to the Wuhan viral lab, but of course the Chinese won't hand the virus over to the world now for further study.

Is it possible that RaTG13 could have been manipulated into COVID–19? Some experts would say yes. And we know, based upon the words of the WIV researcher, Dr. Shi, that the WIV had eight similar viruses to RaTG13, but China won't share those either. What are they hiding?

Here is another interesting feature of COVID–19. It likes humans more than bats. As a matter of fact, it doesn't harm bats. So the CCP propaganda claims this virus comes from bats, but it doesn't like bats. Riddle me that.

Furthermore, no ancestors of COVID–19 have been found. Recall what typically occurs in nature is multiple mutations, just like with the SARS infection. We should be able to find multiple mutations as the virus goes from bat loving, to an intermediate liking animal, to human liking, to human loving. We would certainly welcome contrary evidence from the Wuhan labs.

Now if you will, forgive me for being a bit of a biology lover, but as a physician, I think we have to consider just how utterly ferocious and seemingly too perfect for nature this virus really is.

COVID–19 has a very unique spike protein made up by two units. The first unit has an amazing affinity for human lung cells. It sticks like glue to human lung cells even if you only get a small whiff of it, and it uses the same human lung receptor that researchers in the United States and WIV have been working on together for viral gain of function and similar lab techniques for years. Perhaps this is just another coincidence.

To be fair, I really do think all the research has been done with the best of intentions to develop vaccines for a possible future epidemic. For all I know, the research already done may have significantly sped up the success of Operation Warp Speed.

Next we need to discuss one last point about this protein spike and how it interacts with human lung cells. And if there is a smoking gun, this is it. Remember I talked about this spike, this crown having two components, two units. Well, it just so happens that the human lung cell has a special cleaver, a cleaver that can recognize—you guessed it—a perfect spot on the COVID–19 spike. Bats don't have this ability, but human lung cells do.

Anyway, what happens is, after the COVID–19 virus attaches to the human lung cell like glue, the human lung cell cleaves the COVID–19 in this perfect spot, and only after this cleavage occurs can the virus dump its genetic makeup into the human cell and take over the human genetic machinery.

Now, just don't forget your ninth grade biology class. A virus needs another organism to reproduce, and this COVID–19 virus, once it grabs a human lung cell, it is not letting go until it takes over and starts to multiply like rabbits. After one cell grabs hold and dumps its genetic content, a chain reaction occurs that really reminds me of a nuclear chain reaction. Once viral replication ignites, it is next to impossible to stop.

There are more microbiology nuances we could talk about and why this supervirus is not seemingly a virus from Mother Nature, but I think you get my point. Yes, I could be wrong. I hope I am wrong. But only the Wuhan labs have the data to prove me wrong, and I am afraid the data that would prove me right or wrong has been forever destroyed.

The geographical origination of this virus is much less complex to discuss. Today, all evidence points to the geographical start of this virus from or in very close proximity to the Wuhan labs. The wet market origination theory has been completely dismantled and is really nothing more than the usual CCP propaganda and coverup that we have all seen too often.

Now we know without any doubt that multiple infections predated the January 2020 event surrounding the wet market theory, and all these infections can be traced to a close proximity of the Wuhan labs. In fact, U.S. intelligence reports recently confirmed what we have known for months—that some WIV researchers were hospitalized as early as the fall of 2019.

Just to be clear, these bats that are known to harbor this family of viruses have a range of some 50 miles but live in caves in Yunnan Province approximately 1,000 miles away from Wuhan. The chances of a bat carrying this highly infectious virus 1,000 miles away without leaving a trail of infections between Yunnan and the WIV would be like the same person walking from New York to Kansas and being struck by lightning seven times and surviving.

Again, China has the evidence to prove these theories wrong, and I welcome that data. As a physician, a Senator, a father, and a grandfather, we have to assume and prepare for the worst and judge the situation based upon the body of evidence that best describes this event. We have to get to the bottom of this regardless of whose fault it is or isn't. We will need to know how to forgive. We will need to make others take responsibility. But what we can't do is keep burying our heads in the sand, which is why I am calling on the U.S. delegation to the World Health Assembly meeting this week to do everything in their power to ensure that a full and unrestricted international scientific and forensic investigation into the origins will be authorized and also for a parallel comprehensive, bipartisan Senate investigation into the origins as well.

When that is finished, we need to take up the guardrails for viral gain-of-function studies. But in the meantime, the American people—really the entire world—deserve to know the answers to the origins of the COVID–19 virus.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

S. 1260

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I want to rise to say a few words about the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, which we are debating today. I think that the thrust of that act and what we are trying to accomplish is enormously important.

Right now, as I think most people know, we have a crisis in terms of microchip production here in the United States, and we are becoming increasingly dependent upon countries all over the world. For our own manufacturing sector—the automobile sector, the electronics sector—that is a very bad position to be in, and also, obviously, being dependent on other countries for microchips is a dangerous place to be in terms of national security.

I especially like provisions in this legislation which will increase funding for research and development, increase funding for science and technology, and invest in more Ph.D.s. We need more Ph.D.s in our country in science, technology, engineering, and math. I think those are very important steps in the right direction.

But I do have some very serious concerns about two provisions in this bill. No. 1, I am deeply concerned about the provisions which will provide $52 billion in emergency appropriations for the microchip industry, with no strings attached. Let me repeat that. We are talking about $52 billion in Federal funds—and, by the way, I suspect there will be more taxpayer money coming to these corporations from State and local government—with no strings attached. And, second of all, there is a provision in this bill, not an appropriation but an authorization, to provide some $10 billion to the Blue Origin space company, which is owned by the wealthiest person in the world, Mr. Bezos.

When we talk about the microchip industry, we are talking about an industry that is not a poor, struggling industry. In fact, it is an extremely successful and wealthy industry that is worth now more than half a trillion dollars—more than $500 billion. We are talking about an industry, interestingly enough, that, at the same time we are now trying to provide corporate welfare to them, is an industry that has shut down over 780 manufacturing plants in the United States over the past several decades and laid off 150,000 American workers. So what you have is a situation that, over the last two decades, these very large corporations said: Why do I want to stay in the United States of America, pay workers here a living wage, protect environmental standards? I can go to companies in Asia and elsewhere and buy my products from them. The result, again, is 780 manufacturing plants in the last several decades have shut down in America, and 150,000 American workers were laid off.

Now, let's talk about how we don't know exactly—nobody does—where this $52 billion in corporate welfare is going to go. But, obviously, it will go to some of the larger microchip companies, and one of the very largest is Intel.

Let me say a word about Intel. Last year, Intel made nearly $21 billion in profits. So we are proposing to provide many billions of dollars to a company that, last year, made $21 billion in profits. They spent $14.2 billion on stock buybacks—$14.2 billion on stock buybacks. And, by the way, this company which is in line for a major infusion of U.S. taxpayer money, provided $110 million signing bonus to its CEO, Patrick Gelsinger.

Since 2015, this very same company, Intel, has shipped over 1,000 jobs overseas. Now, interestingly enough, Intel's CEO has admitted recently that it does not need corporate welfare. Let's give them credit for that. The CEO recently said his investment in America ''does not depend on a penny of government support or state support or any other investments to make it successful and never will.'' They are prepared to do it on their own, which is what we hope most private corporations would do.

Now, among the other very large, leading microchip companies is the well-known Texas Instruments. They may well be in line to receive billions of dollars in corporate welfare as well under this piece of legislation.

Last year, Texas Instruments made $5.6 billion in profits and spent $2.5 billion buying back its own stock, while it has outsourced thousands of jobs to low-wage countries. The CEO of Texas Instruments made over $30 million in total compensation last year—more than 400 times what the median worker at that company made. And this is also another company in line to receive billions and billions of dollars in Federal corporate welfare.

Who else might receive corporate welfare under this bill? Well, how about the major semiconductor company from Taiwan called the Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, or what is often referred to as ''TSMC,'' which is a very, very, very large microchip company. It is interesting to note who is the largest shareholder in that company. Well, it should not surprise anybody because this is how countries around the world do industrial policy, but the largest shareholder in TSMC is the Government of Taiwan. So when you give TSMC money, you are giving that money directly to the Government of Taiwan.

Samsung, another very large corporate entity, South Korean, it owns several plants in Texas. So what we are looking at here is a reality where taxpayer money from working people in this country will be going to large, profitable corporations, and several of them are owned literally by other entities.

In total, the top five semiconductor companies that may well receive grants under this legislation made nearly $35 billion in profits and spent more than $18 billion buying back its own stock last year.

So here is the bottom line. I believe that we do want to grow the microchip industry here in the United States of America for reasons that everybody is familiar with. That is the industry that we need if we are going to grow the automobile industry, the electronics industry, and every other industry in this country. And we need to not be dependent upon China and other countries for the microchips that are used in these products.

So I am sympathetic to the goal of this bill, but I am not sympathetic with the idea of simply laying out $52 billion of taxpayers' money with no strings attached.

That is why I have introduced Senate amendment No. 2016. This amendment would prevent microchip companies from receiving taxpayer assistance unless they agree to issue warrants to the Federal Government.

If private companies are going to benefit from over $52 billion in taxpayer subsidies, the financial gains made by these companies must be shared with the American people, not just wealthy shareholders. In other words, all this amendment says is that if these companies want taxpayer assistance, we are not going to socialize all of the risks and privatize all of the profits.

And let me be very clear; this is not a radical idea. This is not something that I made up or any other Senator made up. These exact conditions were imposed on corporations that received taxpayer assistance in the bipartisan CARES Act, which passed the Senate 96 to 0. In other words, every Member of the U.S. Senate has already voted for the conditions that are in the amendment that I cosponsored by Senator WARREN, by the way. They are in the amendment that we are offering.

Further, this amendment will also require companies—again, all of this was in the CARES Act. Every Member or at least 96 Members of the Senate voted for these conditions—not a new idea. So in addition to making sure that companies allow for warrants, it would be demanded that they could not buy back their own stock, not outsource American jobs overseas, not repeal existing collective bargaining agreements, and remain neutral in any union organizing effort.

Again, these are not new ideas, not radical ideas. All of these conditions are identical to the conditions that were placed in the CARES Act, which passed 96 to nothing.

I also want to say a word about the provision in there that authorizes $10 billion for Blue Origin, a company owned by Mr. Bezos.

You know, when we were younger and Neil Armstrong made it to the Moon, there was incredible joy and pride in this country that the United States of America did something that people forever had thought was impossible. We sent a man to the Moon, an extraordinary accomplishment. And the entire world watched that event with bated breath. It was just an extraordinary accomplishment for all of humanity, not just the United States, but we have a special pride because that was our project.

I worry very much that what we are seeing now are two of the wealthiest people in this country—Mr. Musk, Elon Musk, and Mr. Bezos—deciding that they are going to take control over our space efforts to get to the Moon and maybe even the extraordinary accomplishment of getting to Mars. What an accomplishment that would be.

But I have to tell you that I have a real problem that, to a significant degree, we are privatizing that effort. So that as a nation, we will not sit with pride in saying we did it but instead saying, well, maybe Mr. Bezos or maybe Mr. Musk sent somebody to the Moon or maybe even to Mars. This is something that should be an American effort, that all of us should be part of and not simply be a private corporation undertaking. So I have a real problem with the authorization of $10 billion going to somebody who, among other things, is the wealthiest person in this country.

So what I hope very much is that my amendment will be a part of the managers' amendments. I suspect there are Republicans who often tell us about wanting to save taxpayer dollars and not just throw them about who would be sympathetic to this effort, and I know there are a number of Democrats who are as well. So I would hope very much that my amendment No. 2016, which will be modified to just include provisions that were in the CARES bill, that it will be included in the managers' amendments that we will be voting on shortly.

With that, I leave the microphone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, Texas has always been a proud supporter of an ''all of the above'' energy strategy. We are often recognized as an oil and gas powerhouse, which we are, but most folks don't know that we are the No. 1 producer of energy from wind, the No. 1 renewable resource. In fact, we now produce one-quarter of all wind energy in the United States. So if Texas were a country—and my friend from Vermont may be interested in this—we would be the fifth largest wind energy producer in the world.

Mr. SANDERS. I did know that.

Mr. CORNYN. And we don't have any plans of stopping there. We are also making serious strides in energy innovation.

A couple of years ago, I visited the NET Power plant in La Porte, TX, right outside of Houston. NET Power is significant because it has developed a first-of-its-kind power system that generates affordable zero-emissions electricity. Using their unique carbon capture technology, they have taken natural gas, one of the most prevalent and affordable energy sources, and made it emission-free. That is what innovation can produce: emission-free electricity from natural gas.

As impressive as this project is, though, it is made even better by the fact that it is not unique. Private companies are harnessing the power of human ingenuity to make our most used energy sources emission-free. Earlier this year, for example, ExxonMobil announced a $100 billion carbon capture and storage project in the Houston area, otherwise known as the energy capital of the world. This would create a carbon capture innovation zone to significantly reduce carbon emissions.

ExxonMobil estimates this project has the potential to store up to 100 million metric tons of carbon per year by the year 2040. A decade later, Houston could be carbon-neutral.

These kind of developments, I think, are incredibly exciting, and they showcase, once again, the power of innovation not by the government but by the private sector.

If we are able to reduce emissions without harming our energy security, raising taxes, killing high-paying jobs, or driving up costs to consumers on a fixed income, why wouldn't we? Breakneck changes in technology have fueled our economy, propelled the communications sector, and completely transformed our daily lives.

It is time to harness American ingenuity to revolutionize the energy sector. Smart policies can't prioritize only conservation, productivity, or economic power. We need to strike a balance of all three. You are simply not going to achieve the balance by imposing heavy-handed regulations or making it more expensive. Unfortunately, that seems to be exactly the path our Democratic colleagues in the Finance Committee want to take.

Over the last couple of years, we have seen no shortage of unrealistic and downright harmful policies that are advocated for in the name of reducing carbon emissions. Some of our colleagues have proposed everything from the socialist paradise that is the Green New Deal to a more targeted but no more realistic net zero emissions bill.

Tomorrow, as I suggested, the Finance Committee will mark up the latest proposal, legislation introduced by Chairman WYDEN known by the innocuous name of the Clean Energy for America Act. But the bill is anything but innocuous. The bill proposes a complete overhaul of the energy tax code to finance the full gamut of clean energy policies. At its core, though, it is an anti-fossil fuel bill.

Given the fact that more than 60 percent of our electricity is generated by fossil fuels, that strikes me as a pretty radical position to take. This proposal uses a variety of tax increases to place a squeeze on fossil fuel producers and to push America toward renewables, which accounted for no less than 20 percent of our energy production last year. In other words, they want to push us into the renewable space that only accounted for 20 percent of our energy production—completely unrealistic.

This proposal would drive up costs for American energy producers and consumers, who would be the ones ultimately footing the bill. Namely, senior citizens and those on fixed incomes would be the ones hurt the most.

I also have serious concerns about how this dramatic shift would impact our energy security. The higher cost of domestic oil would, once again, make the United States rely on countries like Russia, Iran, and Venezuela for our energy needs, and obviously we can all see the dangers that would produce.

Our friend John McCain aptly described Russia at one time as ''a gas station masquerading as a country.'' Well, that was pretty funny, but it is also pretty accurate. Having the United States and our other allies over a barrel because of lack of energy diversification and domestic production gives them a lot of power—and too much power.

We know what it has been like for recent decades before we became more self-sufficient when it came to energy production. I remember, back in 1980, Jimmy Carter famously issued the Carter doctrine after the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. He suggested that if anyone, any country, any adversary of the United States were to blockade the Strait of Hormuz, it would be an act of war because the oil that flowed through the Strait of Hormuz was essential for our national security and our economy.

So why in the world would we want to return to those bad old days when we were dependent on imported energy? Well, this issue was further underscored in 2009, when Russia effectively turned off the gas in Ukraine for almost 3 weeks. This affected at least 10 countries in Europe whose natural gas flowed through that pipeline in Ukraine.

If these tax hikes slowly strangle U.S. energy companies, we could end up in the same position: dependent on others for our basic energy needs. After years of building our energy independence and strengthening our energy security, now is not the time to turn back the clock. We simply should not put ourselves in a position where we are reliant on any other country, let alone our adversaries, to keep our lights on and to keep our economy humming.

And the consequences don't stop there. Beyond harming our energy security, the legislation that the Finance Committee will consider tomorrow would kill countless high-paying jobs. It would weaken our global competitiveness and reverse the economic gains we have made because of a thriving oil and gas industry. And that is just scratching the surface of this misguided bill.

One of the most outrageous provisions, though, is the electric vehicle tax credit proposal. We all know that out of the 280 million cars on the road in America, the vast majority of Americans drive cars that run on gas or diesel. When they fill up their tank at the gas station, they pay a user fee, or a tax, on every gallon they buy. Some of that money goes into the highway trust fund, the pot of money that pays to build and repair the roads and bridges we drive on every day. As we all know, though, the highway trust fund is in dire straits. Unless something changes, the shortfall over the next decade is expected to be nearly $200 billion.

Those who drive electric cars don't buy gasoline, obviously. They don't contribute to the highway trust fund. They don't pay anything to drive on the roads and bridges every other American has to pay for and ultimately subsidizes.

The proposal by the chairman of the Finance Committee doubles down on this problem and makes Americans do even more to subsidize the pricey electric vehicles owned by wealthy consumers. This legislation extends electric vehicle incentives, which will come at the cost of other taxpayers, without addressing the fact that electric vehicles are already driving on taxpayer-funded roads virtually free of charge. This is incredibly expensive and benefits only a limited group of wealthy Americans.

Let's compare the cost of this program to the carbon capture projects I mentioned. Current electric vehicle subsidies equate to spending about $455 for every ton of CO_2 that is reduced. As a reminder, this applies only to emission reduction for cars. Electric vehicle subsidies have zero bearing on the carbon emission of the manufacturing sector, power generation, or other emission-intensive industries.

Carbon capture and storage, like the ExxonMobil project I mentioned earlier, can apply to virtually every source of emissions and at a much

lower cost. CO_2 can be abated for $100 to $200 per ton. That is less than half the price of an electric vehicle subsidy.

I support efforts to reduce carbon emissions to preserve our air, land, and water for future generations, but those efforts don't have to come at this sort of exorbitant price. You can support all energy sectors and innovation and conservation. These are not mutually exclusive.

One great example is a bill I introduced called the LEADING Act, which was signed into law last year. This legislation incentivizes the research and development of carbon capture technology for natural gas and innovation in the energy industry at large. That is how we can keep costs down for taxpayers and maintain this revolution in the energy sector.

So I will continue to push back on efforts to weaken our energy independence and harm our economy in pursuit of arbitrary goals. There is simply no reason to stick taxpayers with the bill for these unnecessary policies when there are better commonsense ways to promote both innovation and conservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session; that the Senate resume consideration of S. 1260; and that the following amendments be called up and reported by number: Wyden, 1975; Crapo, 1565; Paul, 2003; Ernst, 1507; Daines, 1787; and Lee, 1891; further, that at 4:45 p.m. today, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed with no amendments in order to these amendments prior to the vote in relation to the amendment, with 60 affirmative votes required for adoption and 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to each vote.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate will now resume legislative session.

The Senator from Mississippi.

S. 1260

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I would like to be recognized for a moment before we proceed.

This is an important step in the consideration of the Endless Frontier Act. We have just locked in six votes for this afternoon—two important side by sides, WYDEN and CRAPO on Finance Committee matters; a Paul amendment on the National Institutes of Health funds being used in China; an Ernst amendment on the Wuhan lab; a Daines amendment on intellectual property in China; and the Lee amendment on stem cell research.

This is a great step forward; that the Senate is proceeding this afternoon to regular order, and regular order allowing Senators to come forward and offer amendments that might improve the bill is helpful. It is hoped that we can do that again tomorrow and Thursday and move toward an opportunity to pass this bill.

I would point out to my colleagues—and I know the distinguished chair of the Finance Committee will agree with this. We have locked in six 15-minute votes. In fairness, really, the five subsequent votes should be 10-minute votes. We can fool around and wander in here for hours and be here until 8 or we can begin at 4:45 and resume the practice that we had for years before we quit doing regular order in this body.

If Members will hold each other accountable and if the Chair is willing to say after a certain amount of time, if a straggler is missing, that that Senator simply has missed votes, then we can do this in an orderly fashion. I have an appointment at 5:30 that I have had to cancel. Perhaps others will have to do that too.

But we are making progress on a very substantive bill about the future of this country and moving toward competing in a better way with China. And I would suggest that maybe appointments in the early afternoon might be canceled, and we can get back to quick votes and be considerate of others, realizing that some of us may miss votes if we are late. I make that suggestion, and I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the hard work in locking in these six votes.

I yield back.

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT—Resumed

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

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

Pending:

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

Cantwell amendment No. 1527 (to amendment No. 1502), of a perfecting nature.

AMENDMENT NOS. 1975, 1565, 2003, 1507, 1787, AND 1891 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1502

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the following amendments will be called up and reported by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], for herself and others, proposes en bloc amendments numbered 1975, 1565, 2003, 1507, 1787, and 1891 to amendment No. 1502.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1975

(Purpose: To set forth trade policy, negotiating objectives, and congressional oversight requirements relating to the response to the COVID–19 pandemic)

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. TRADE POLICY AND CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF COVID–19 RESPONSE.

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

(1) it is imperative to promote the development and deployment of vaccines, including to address pandemics like the pandemic relating to COVID–19 and its variants;

(2) as a developed nation with a longstanding commitment to promoting global health, innovation, access to medicine, public welfare, and security, the United States will continue to use the resources and tools at its disposal to promote the distribution of life-saving COVID–19 vaccines to other countries;

(3) President Biden should continue to work with foreign governments, multilateral institutions, nongovernmental organizations, manufacturers, and other stakeholders to quickly identify and address, through targeted and meaningful action, obstacles to ending the COVID–19 pandemic, whether those obstacles are legal, regulatory, contractual, or otherwise;

(4) in any efforts to address trade-related obstacles to ending the COVID–19 pandemic, President Biden should consider how any action would complement the whole-of-government approach of the President to ending the COVID–19 pandemic worldwide, including how any action would impact competitiveness, innovation, and the national security of the United States in the short- and long-term;

(5) the President should strive to create the most appropriate balance between access to COVID–19 vaccines and therapeutics and generating an innovative environment in the United States;

(6) the President should take into account the efforts of malign nations or entities to obtain intellectual property of United States persons through forced technology transfer, theft, or espionage, and accordingly make all efforts to protect that intellectual property from such nations or entities; and

(7) in any efforts to address trade-related obstacles to ending the COVID–19 pandemic, Congress expects timely and meaningful consultations on any negotiations and any agreements or decisions reached regarding matters of concern to members of Congress and their constituents, including issues of competitiveness, innovation, and national security.

(b) TRADE POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO THE COVID–19 PANDEMIC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States to facilitate an effective and efficient response to the global pandemic with respect to COVID–19 by expediting access to life-saving vaccines, medicines, diagnostics, medical equipment, and personal protective equipment.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The United States Trade Representative shall pursue a timely, effective, and efficient response to the trade aspects of the COVID–19 pandemic, including by endeavoring to—

(A) expedite access to medicines and life-saving products through trade facilitation measures;

(B) obtain a reduction or elimination of nontariff barriers and distortions that impact the procurement of life-saving products;

(C) take action to increase access to COVID–19 vaccines globally, while avoiding providing access to intellectual property to nations or entities that seek to utilize the

technology for other uses or that may otherwise pose a threat to national security;

(D) eliminate practices that adversely affect trade in perishable or temperature-sensitive products, and facilitate the transfer of materials and products in a manner that preserves their integrity;

(E) further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines by demonstrating sufficient flexibility to respond to a global crisis while retaining a balanced approach to the rights of innovators;

(F) encourage greater cooperation between the World Trade Organization and other international organizations and public-private partnerships, including the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund (commonly referred to as ''UNICEF''), the World Bank, and Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance; and

(G) take into account other legitimate domestic policies of the United States, including health and safety, national security, consumer interests, intellectual property rights, and the laws and regulations related thereto.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—

(1) INTENT TO NEGOTIATE.—If the United States Trade Representative enters any negotiation pursuant to the trade policies described in subsection (b), the Trade Representative shall—

(A) submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register a statement specifying the objectives of the United States in pursuing the negotiation; and

(B) submit to Congress an assessment of how and to what extent entering the negotiation will achieve the trade policies described in subsection (b).

(2) CONSULTATION AND BRIEFING BEFORE MAKING PROPOSALS.—Before making any textual proposal pursuant to the trade policies described in subsection (b), the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) consistent with section 242 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1872), consult with the heads of relevant Federal agencies, including the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Defense, which shall include, as appropriate, discussion of—

(i) the most effective means of addressing the COVID–19 pandemic and any variants to the COVID–19 virus, including by increasing the distribution of COVID–19 vaccines;

(ii) any sensitive technology or intellectual property rights related to the proposal;

(iii) any nations or entities of concern that may benefit from the proposal; and

(iv) other issues that may influence negotiations with respect to the proposal; and

(B) brief members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on the proposal, including with respect to how the objectives sought by the Trade Representative fit into a larger strategy of ending the COVID–19 pandemic.

(3) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—In the course of any negotiations pursuant to the trade policies described in subsection (b), the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(B) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, including by providing any relevant text proposals before discussing those proposals with negotiation participants;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4203(c)) and each committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and each joint committee of Congress, with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by the negotiations; and

(D) follow the guidelines on enhanced coordination with Congress established pursuant to section 104(a)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4203(a)(3)) regarding consultations with Congress, access to text, and public engagement for the negotiations to the same extent as those guidelines apply to negotiations covered under that section.

(4) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE CONCLUDING NEGOTIATIONS.—

(A) CONSULTATION.—Before either reaching a final agreement or exercising authority provided under section 122(b)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3532(b)(3)) pursuant to the trade policies described in subsection (b), the United States Trade Representative shall consult with—

(i) the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives;

(ii) each committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and each joint committee of Congress, with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by the agreement or exercise of authority; and

(iii) the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4203(c)).

(B) SCOPE.—In conducting consultation under subparagraph (A), the Trade Representative shall—

(i) provide the text of any proposed agreement for final consideration; and

(ii) consult with respect to—

(I) the nature of the agreement; and

(II) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the trade policies described in subsection (b).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''World Trade Organization'', ''WTO'', and ''WTO member'' have the meanings given those terms in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

AMENDMENT NO. 1565

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of May 19, 2021, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 2003

(Purpose: To prohibit the National Institutes of Health and any other Federal agency from funding gain-of-function research conducted in China)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR GAIN-OF-FUNCTION RESEARCH CONDUCTED IN CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No funds made available to any Federal agency, including the National Institutes of Health, may be used to conduct gain-of-function research in China.

(b) DEFINITION OF GAIN-OF-FUNCTION RESEARCH.—In this section, the term ''gain-of-function research'' means any research project that may be reasonably anticipated to confer attributes to influenza, MERS, or SARS viruses such that the virus would have enhanced pathogenicity or transmissibility in mammals.

AMENDMENT NO. 1507

(Purpose: To prohibit any Federal funding for the Wuhan Institute of Virology)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL FUNDING FOR WUHAN INSTITUTE OF VIROLOGY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funding may be made available to the Wuhan Institute of Virology located in the City of Wuhan in the People's Republic of China.

AMENDMENT NO.1787

(Purpose: To direct the President to enforce the intellectual property provisions of the Economic and Trade Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of China)

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROVISIONS OF ECONOMIC AND TRADE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA.

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

(1) the Agreement includes significant mandates for the People's Republic of China related to its domestic intellectual property regime, including with respect to copyrights, trademarks, trade secrets, and patents;

(2) the changes included in the Agreement, if implemented effectively, should improve the domestic intellectual property framework of the People's Republic of China, which has historically proven to harm the innovation and creative communities in the United States;

(3) despite commitments made by the Government of the People's Republic of China under the Agreement, ongoing market access barriers, uneven enforcement, measures requiring forced technology transfer, and serious deficiencies in the rule of law continue to make the business environment in the People's Republic of China highly challenging for rights holders in the United States;

(4) as reflected in the 2021 report by the United States Trade Representative required under section 182(h) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242(h)) (commonly referred to as the ''Special 301 Report''), the People's Republic of China has consistently been listed in that annual report since 1989 as a trading partner of the United States that ''fails to provide adequate and effective IP protection and enforcement for U.S. inventors, creators, brands, manufacturers, and service providers, which, in turn, harm American workers''; and

(5) Congress encourages the United States Trade Representative, the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office—

(A) to use all available tools to ensure that the People's Republic of China fully implements its commitments under the Agreement; and

(B) to actively consider additional means to require the People's Republic of China to address unfair market access barriers, forced technology transfer requirements, and broader intellectual property theft concerns, including through future trade agreements and working with partners in multilateral organizations, such as the Group of 7 (G7), the Group of 20 (G20), and the World Trade Organization.

(b) ENFORCEMENT OF AGREEMENT.—The President, acting through the United States Trade Representative, shall coordinate with

the heads of such Federal agencies as the President considers appropriate to enforce the actions related to intellectual property laid out in the Agreement including—

(1) the civil, administrative, and criminal procedures and deterrent-level civil and criminal penalties provided in the Agreement; and

(2) by using the full enforcement authority of the President, including any enforcement authority in connection with the identification and reporting process under section 182 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242).

(c) REPORT ON STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the status of the implementation by the People's Republic of China of its obligations under Chapter 1 of the Agreement.

(2) INFORMATION IN REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall contain information sufficient to enable the appropriate committees of Congress to assess the extent of the compliance by the People's Republic of China with the Agreement, including appropriate quantitative metrics.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term ''Agreement'' means the Economic and Trade Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of China, dated January 15, 2020.

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 1891

(Purpose: To impose limitations on research)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. LIMITATION ON RESEARCH.

None of the activities authorized by this Act may include, conduct, or support any research—

(1) using fetal tissue obtained from an induced abortion or any derivatives thereof;

(2) in which a human embryo is created or destroyed, discarded, or put at risk of injury;

(3) in which an embryo-like entity is created wholly or in part from human cells or components;

(4) in which a human embryo is intentionally created or modified to include a heritable genetic modification; or

(5) using any stem cell the derivation of which would be inconsistent with the standards established herein.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon, along with several of our colleagues, to discuss the need to end the policy of taxation without representation, which millions of Americans in the District of Columbia have endured for over 200 years and hundreds of thousands still endure today.

This policy was wrong in 1776, when 13 colonies took on the mightiest nation on Earth to end it. It is wrong today, and we seek to end it through the enactment of S. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

In just 6 days, our country will observe Memorial Day, a holiday often observed to mark the start of summer. We celebrate it to mark the start of summer. But on Memorial Day of this year, many of us will pause to remember the generations of Americans in our Armed Forces who have laid down their lives for our country. That is what Memorial Day is all about. This day means something special in my own family. My own maternal grandmother was a Gold Star mother.

With the death of John McCain, I am the last Vietnam veteran serving in the U.S. Senate.

The names of some 58,000 men and women with whom John and I served are engraved on a black granite wall near the Lincoln Memorial, just a few miles from where we are standing today. The heroes named on that wall include brave men and women from Washington, DC, as well. Since World War I, in fact, over 5,000 Americans from the District of Columbia have lost their lives in service to the United States. And, today, roughly 15,000 DC residents are on Active Duty or serving as reservists or members of the National Guard in the States. That is 15,000 Americans serving dutifully in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, or the Coast Guard.

Our Nation's Capital is home to more than just monuments and museums. It is home to Americans who work, who start businesses, and who contribute to America's economy. And just like all 50 States represented in this body, the District of Columbia is home to veterans and servicemembers who risk their lives for our country, even today. But, year after year, they come home to find that they are still denied the ability to have a real say in our Nation's future.

These heroes are among the nearly 700,000 Americans who call the District home and for generations have lived without voting representation in Congress. That is why I view Washington, DC's statehood not as a Republican or Democratic issue, not as a political issue but as an American issue—as an issue of basic fairness and equality.

Earlier this year, the senior Senator from Utah sought to overturn a law passed by the DC City Council, right here on the Senate floor. As U.S. Senators, neither of us should have such an opportunity to intervene in a local matter like that. But in the Senate, we have power over the budget of the District of Columbia—let me just point this out—a city that has a double A-plus credit rating—double A-plus. I am an old State treasurer. That is pretty darned good—better than most States, in fact, if you check.

We also have confirmation power in the Congress over the District's judges, an arrangement that needlessly led to extensive judicial vacancies and delayed justices for weeks, for months, and, in some cases, for years. That is wrong.

I reminded my colleagues that day that no one in this room was elected by the people of the District of Columbia. Nobody in this room was elected by the people of the District of Columbia, and no one here was able to stand up and represent their interests. This should be unacceptable in a 21st century democracy.

However, I believe that the tide is starting to turn. I believe we can finally make DC statehood a reality during this Congress, the 117th Congress.

We have a fearless champion in the House, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. With her leadership, along with that of the Speaker and Leader STENY HOYER, the House passed their DC statehood bill last month for the second time—the second time ever.

We also have, for the first time, a President who formally supports ending this policy—this modern-day policy—of taxation without representation. And in the Senate, we have a record 45 cosponsors on our bill to make the District of Columbia a State, a number that represents Members from rural and urban areas alike. This number has grown steadily since my friend, our former colleague, Joe Lieberman—a fiercely independent Senator from Connecticut—led this charge in the Senate before passing the baton to me in 2013.

I know that some of our colleagues have said that DC statehood is unconstitutional. To be clear, the District of Columbia has taken the same steps for statehood that 37 other States have taken since 1791—the same steps—a process clearly laid out in our Constitution. This case was made clearly in a letter to Congress just this week from nearly 40 leading constitutional scholars, who wrote that Congress is well within its rights to grant statehood.

On a different holiday later this summer, we will be celebrating July Fourth to remember those who fought for our independence, and I will remind my colleagues again that the Founding Fathers, the same men who wrote our Constitution, had a rallying cry during the Revolutionary War: There is no taxation without representation.

Yet that is exactly what is happening to the citizens in the District of Columbia today. The reality is that these citizens pay the most—get this, the citizens of the District of Columbia pay the most—in per capita Federal income taxes in the United States, more than any other State, but they have no say in how those dollars are spent, none.

This second-class status must come to an end, and we in Congress are the ones who can do something about it.

Winston Churchill once said: You can always count on America to do the right thing in the end, after they have tried everything else.

It is never too late to do the right thing. The right thing to do now is to ensure that nearly 700,000 Americans living in the District of Columbia, serving in our military, voting, actually have a chance to vote on the representation in this body and in the House. The right thing to do is to end this policy of taxation without representation.

With that, I thank you, and I yield the floor to some of my colleagues who, I believe, will be joining us on this call, including the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I am honored to join in a colloquy with some of my colleagues today on this urgent issue to really talk about the central function of our democracy, whether the ideals of this Nation are real for every American.

Now, if you cut me, I am going to bleed Jersey. But let me tell you very plainly that I am proud to have grown up in Jersey, but I am also proud to have been born in Washington, DC. This is where my parents met after college. This is where they fell in love. Their first date was at the Jefferson Memorial, at the paddle boats there at the Reflecting Pool. They, there, remember—telling me—just the love they had for each other that was already dawning, but also this fierce allegiance to this incredible community that is Washington, DC. My mom talked about the activism that was here. She was working for the public schools as a speech pathologist, and she talked about this patriotic feel that she had, especially when she was helping to organize the March on Washington. The words on the Jefferson Memorial, where my parents had their first date, at the end of Declaration of Independence, say: ''[W]e mutually pledge . . . our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.''

That is what we are called to pledge to one another, but for too long the people of this city have not had the honor, the privileges, the equal citizenship rights that so many others in every State in our Union, in all parts of our democracy, enjoy. These are rights, as my colleague says, that Washington, DC—in fact, disproportionate to many other States—people from this community have bled for and died for.

This city is an extraordinary place. It is a community. It outnumbers, in fact, in population other States. And we believe that the ideals of one person, one vote, no taxation without representation—that all of these are rights being denied fellow Americans. Where is the honor in that?

Veterans and servicemembers living here in DC did indeed fight for us, put their lives on the line for us, but do not have equal citizenship rights.

The people of DC pay both local and Federal taxes that go to help the people in red States and blue States. They are a city that pays more taxes than they are necessarily receiving back, but when the people of DC need help, when they need an advocate with voting power, they don't have one in this body or in the one across the hall.

The lack of representation really has consequences—serious ones—that significantly decreases DC's leverage in getting laws passed and securing vital resources for its residents. We saw this firsthand in the first COVID–19 stimulus bill. Washington, DC, received $725 million less in critical aid than other less populous States. That was funding needed for Washington, DC, first responders, for COVID–19 tests, and other important lifesaving services. They were treated as second-class citizens.

How is this fair? How is this just? How is this sacred honor? And how can this be partisan? These are our sacrosanct values for those of us on both sides of the aisle. This is how our democracy was intended to function. These were some of the elements of the Revolutionary War.

I am hard-pressed to believe that my colleagues on either side of the aisle don't recognize that to deny the people of Washington, DC, representation is contrary to the values that we state regularly on this floor. Making DC a State is truly a civil rights issue, and it is also an issue of racial justice.

DC is a majority-minority city, and the people of this city deserve the same opportunity that other less populated States have to make their voices heard in Congress. This is especially urgent as we are seeing so many States around the country enact sweeping voting laws intended to make it harder for the DC majority—Black and Brown folks—to even vote.

As U.S. Senators, we have an obligation not just to pass laws but to be stewards of democratic ideals and principals. We took an oath to that. Making DC a State is not just a matter of civil rights for DC. It is about all of us because our democracy will only survive as long as its true representation is that of all of its people. Truly, we know in this Nation—it has been said by greater leaders before us—that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

The people of DC have made clear what they want, saying it loudly. They deserve full citizenship rights. They deserve the right to vote. They deserve the right to have representation. They want to be the 51st State. They should be the 51st State.

My parents lived for many years in this city, and I heard about DC statehood as a little boy growing up in New Jersey. For them, it was a matter of dignity and respect. It was a matter of valuing this community and the richness of its people. To them, it is a shortfall in the evolution of our democracy that the people of this great city should be denied the very ideals that are written on the Jefferson Memorial.

I urge my colleagues to move on this and to grant this DC statehood and to afford them the sacred honor that all Americans deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I am thrilled to rise and join my colleagues in pressing the case for DC statehood. I won't be long because I was on the floor about 3 weeks ago talking about this same matter. I really talked about Virginia then. I talked about Patrick Henry.

The phrase ''no taxation without representation'' is a phrase that we learn coming up in elementary school. The root of it isn't really at the beginning of, say, the Declaration of Independence or during the Revolutionary War; that phrase really came about as colonists rallied to oppose the Stamp Act.

The Stamp Act was an act of Parliament in 1765 that put a tax on paper goods, including newspapers and pamphlets and periodicals. The English Crown was getting very, very worried about the restive nature of Americans pressing their case for being treated equally as royal colonists and subjects of the Crown, but they were not happy with the way they were being treated.

The Stamp Act was an attempt not just to levy a tax, but it was also an attempt to shut down their rights to have political discussions.

Patrick Henry led an effort in the Virginia General Assembly in 1765 that came to be known as the four resolves. He put five resolves on the table, one of which was set aside, but four resolves were passed, and the core of the four resolves was to protest taxation without representation.

One of my great regrets was wanting to hear the great orators of history and never to have had a chance to hear Patrick Henry, although I have heard good Patrick Henry impersonations at St. John's Church in Richmond. What a powerful speaker—the ''Give me liberty or give me death'' speech on the very kind of verge of the United States declaring independence; his court advocacy as a relatively untrained lawyer in Virginia on behalf of religious freedoms so that people who were not part of the established Church of England could still practice their faith as they chose. But many believe that Henry's advocacy against the Stamp Act was his most powerful oratory.

I read excerpts from the resolves when I was here 3 weeks ago, but now I want to jump from Patrick Henry to somebody else who is very much in the spirit of Patrick Henry, and that is Frederick Douglass.

If DC becomes a State, it will become a State named in honor of the abolitionist Frederick Douglass.

Frederick Douglass certainly was an inheritor of the Patrick Henry tradition. He was enslaved for the first 20 years of his life, and then following the Civil War, he moved to the Nation's Capital to become so many things—diplomat, civil rights leader, confidant of President Lincoln, President Grant, and others.

In his autobiography, ''The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass,'' he wrote:

> The District of Columbia is the one spot where there is no government for the people, of the people, and by the people. Its citizens submit to rulers whom they have had no choice in selecting. They obey laws which they had no voice in making. They have a

[sic] plenty of taxation, but no representation. In the great questions of politics in the country, they can march with neither army [neither party], but are relegated to the position of neuters.

Those are the words of the great Frederick Douglass echoing the Patrick Henry speech a century earlier against the Stamp Act. Those words are as true today as they were when he wrote them, and they were as true when he wrote them as when Patrick Henry delivered them in 1765.

In the history of States coming into the Union, most States have some pretty interesting background and history, but there are some common themes. The two commonalities—but then there has been one quirk that I want to mention as I conclude—the two commonalities are States come into the Union when they achieve sufficient population and when they have a demonstrated desire that is not just temporary, effervescent, but is essentially fixed and permanent.

In the mid-1800s, Congress would set a population deadline. Say, for example, in the Northwest Territory, Michigan was told: As soon as you get to 60,000 residents, then we will entertain you if you want to be a State, but you have to do a referendum first.

There is no minimum number established by Congress in terms of population now to become a State, but we would all agree that DC would pass any minimum because DC is larger than States that currently are part of the Union. So whatever criteria we might set—well, you need to be of sufficient size to be a State—DC has met that.

DC has met the second criteria as well, which is demonstrated desire, most recently in a referendum in 2016 where the overwhelming sentiment of DC, as you would expect, was a patriotic sentiment: We want to be a State of the greatest Nation on Earth.

So those two criteria have usually been sufficient for States having demonstrated that or territories or populations having demonstrated that to become part of the Union and to have their star added to the flag of this country.

There have been controversies, though, bluntly, when States have sizable minority populations.

The quest of Hawaii for statehood took longer than it otherwise would have because many Members of this body stood on the floor and expressed concerns about whether Hawaii would be a cultural match for the United States because of the predominant API and indigenous population. I am sad to say that some of those who took the floor and raised those questions and objections were from Virginia.

The State of New Mexico had a particularly rocky path to becoming a State because Members of this body, including from Virginia, took the floor and raised a question about the size, the population, the percentage of New Mexico's indigenous and Latino population.

About 46 percent of the population of DC is African American, folks who—many march in the footsteps and quest for the same equality that Frederick Douglass was questing for in the 1800s.

I hope we can show that the failures of the past that led statehood for New Mexico and Hawaii to take perhaps longer than should have been the case—I hope we will have learned something from that and can move finally to grant these 700,000-plus residents of this wonderful city in our Nation's Capital the ability to be a State.

The last thing I will say is this. I did say this when I was on the floor 3 months ago. We haven't added a State, we haven't added a star to our flag for I guess 70 years now, about 70 years. I don't think a fixed number of stars on the flag sends a message of a growing, thriving nation. I think it might send the message of a nation that is kind of fixed. When you are fixed and set and not willing to change, I believe that can almost send a little bit of a message of decline.

Throughout our Nation's history, the addition of stars to the flag has sent the message of an America that—we are not done growing. We are not done expanding. We are on the move. History isn't done with us yet.

The fact that we haven't added a State—this has been the longest period of time in the history of the United States where we haven't added a star to the flag. I think doing so would suggest very powerfully that the best days of our Nation aren't behind us; they are still ahead of us.

For these reasons and those articulated by my colleagues, I strongly support the effort for DC statehood.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking the senior Senator from Delaware for his longtime persistence in making sure that this Congress ultimately does the right thing and makes the District of Columbia the 51st State.

I want to thank Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for representing the people of the District of Columbia so ably. She deserves a vote in the House of Representatives just like every other Member of the House of Representatives from the 50 States. The District of Columbia deserves two Senators right here in the U.S. Congress.

I want to thank President Biden for saying that if this Senate will just get this bill to his desk, he will sign that piece of legislation and make sure that these people in the District of Columbia are represented as every other citizen in the 50 States is currently represented.

All of us come to this floor and we hear our colleagues on both sides of the aisle talking about the importance of democracy overseas. We criticize China, rightly, when it begins to snuff out the right to vote in Hong Kong. We criticize the authoritarian rulers in Belarus when they clamp down on freedom. We look around the world, and we try our best to establish a standard for standing up for the principle of democracy. We are not always consistent. We are not always constant in that message, but we make an effort to do that. We need to look in the mirror and make that same effort right here at home.

I hear so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talking about the importance of democracy around the world, but when it comes to granting the people in the District of Columbia the full rights of a democracy—the right to two votes in the Senate and a vote in the House—they are not there.

The people of the District of Columbia are fed up and tired of the hypocrisy. They are even more fed up about what my friend and colleague, the Senator from Virginia, was just talking about—the fact that they contribute in every way to our country but are denied the right to have voting representation in the House and the Senate.

As the Senator from Virginia said and others have said, a founding principle of our revolution was the idea that nobody should be subject to taxation without representation. The Senator from Virginia talked about Patrick Henry, and there are others who we know established that principle. Here in the Nation's Capital, the people of the District of Columbia pay higher taxes than those in 22 other States; yet they don't have a vote in the House or two Senators to represent them.

They have also had people who served in every one of our wars, who spilled blood for this country. Yet, while they helped to protect our democracy from threats abroad, they don't have the right here, in our democracy, to cast those votes for voting representatives in the House and the Senate.

This is not a partisan issue. We know it shouldn't be. We know that if every Member put on a blindfold and just said that the people of the District of Columbia deserve a vote without thinking of the political outcome, the people of the District of Columbia would have a State.

As others have pointed out, two States have smaller populations, but they have two Senators who can cast votes here in this Chamber. The State of Wyoming and the State of Vermont are both smaller population-wise than the District of Columbia, but they have those rights and representatives here in the U.S. Senate.

We should move forward with the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, and to hear our Republican colleagues oppose this idea, since they don't want to take it on the principle of democracy—we have heard some absurd reasons given for why the District of Columbia should not be a State. Here are a few. And if anybody doubts that Republican Members in the House or Senate have said these things, I will be happy to show it to you.

We have heard from Members of Congress that people of the District of Columbia don't deserve statehood because it doesn't have a landfill. We have heard that the District of Columbia shouldn't be given statehood because it needs more car dealerships. First, they said: Well, it can't be a State because it has no car dealerships, but now it doesn't have enough of them. Others have said: Well, because it lacks a mining industry, how could it possibly be a State? And then most recently, we heard that it would be unfair to give the people of the District of a Columbia a State here because their representatives would have an unfair advantage. They would have special superpowers because they would be so close to this Capitol that they would somehow be able to get an unfair leg up on everybody else here in the U.S. Senate.

These are reasons that Republican House Members and Senators have given for denying the people of the District of Columbia the right to statehood. We all know what they are. It is just a wall of excuses in their trying to obfuscate and prevent us from getting to the main issue. If you don't want to talk about the principle of democracy, change the subject.

The real concern, as we know, is that the people of the District of Columbia will cast votes for representatives in the House and Senate who they think best reflect their interests, and they believe that, in the current situation, those seats will go to Democratic Members in the Senate and the House.

As my colleagues have said, the District of Columbia is comprised of a majority of people of color, and the Senator from Virginia talked about the history of that having been an impediment to the admission of some other States in the past before the country did the right thing. We have the power to do the right thing.

I have here a letter from 39 constitutional scholars affirming our authority to make the District of Columbia the 51st State. We should do it.

Frederick Douglass once noted that the District of Columbia was ''one spot where there is no government for the people, of the people, and by the people.'' His words are a call from history—a call that demands that we reflect on this act of selective disenfranchisement that has been happening for generations and which is still happening to this day right outside of this building right now. Let us change that today. Let us change that and make this the 51st State and name it in honor of Frederick Douglass.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I first want to thank my colleague and friend Senator CARPER for leading this effort with S. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act. It is long overdue that we acknowledge an injustice in our country and give the citizens of the District of Columbia their full representation rights by statehood.

I have been working on this issue for a long time. When I was the speaker of the Maryland General Assembly almost 40 years ago, the Maryland General Assembly took action to give full representation to the people of the District in the Congress of the United States. That was 40 years ago, and we are still working on this issue. It is long overdue that we acknowledge a shortcoming in our own system for 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia.

I had the honor of chairing the U.S. Helsinki Commission. It is the implementing arm for the Helsinki Final Act of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. It has the membership of all of the countries of Europe and the former Soviet Union, Central Asia, Canada, and the United States. I mention that because in 1975, those countries entered into an agreement on basic, fundamental democratic principles, including the right to have representative government.

That document also gives us the opportunity and obligation to question whether member states are in compliance with the Helsinki Final Act. Quite frankly, we have used that opportunity to raise issues in countries.

Our Presiding Officer has been very aggressive in his comments about Russia, and we have used that to bring up the fact that Russia violated the commitments of the Helsinki Final Act when it invaded Ukraine and when it took over Crimea, and it is still interfering with the sovereignty of Ukraine. We have offered our objections when Russia's Government has stepped on the human rights of the people of its own country—like those of Aleksei Navalny's, the opposition leader, being imprisoned and tortured. That is in violation of the Helsinki Final Act. We have raised those issues.

We have raised those issues about another member state, Turkey, when they have jailed journalists or failed to allow civil society an opportunity to be heard, for they are violations of the Helsinki Final Act.

For us to have credibility in raising these issues of other countries that are violating the fundamental principles, we have to self-evaluate where we are. If we are going to be leaders, we have to acknowledge our own shortcomings and take steps to eliminate those shortcomings.

Quite frankly, we are an outlier when it comes to the representation for the people of the District of Columbia. We have violated their basic rights. We are the only country in the world wherein the citizens of its capital do not have the opportunity to vote for representatives in the national legislature. That is not a distinction that we want to have.

The 700,000 people who live in the District are being denied representation in their government. As has been pointed out, it is larger than some of our States. Those States have fewer people but have two U.S. Senators and a Member of the House of Representatives, and the people of the District should be likewise treated.

This is not a matter of politics; this is a matter of fundamental rights. America's strength is in our values, in who we are as a people. Our ability to lead globally depends upon our doing the right thing at home.

We need to give the District of Columbia that status. The House has already done this. It passed H.R. 51. It has done this and has given the bill to us. All we need to do now is take it up and pass it. So let us act now, at long last, and do what is right for the people of the District and do what is right for the people of our Nation by correcting this violation that we have in our system. Let's pass S. 51, led by Senator CARPER, for DC statehood and make sure that America continues to lead in democratic values around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before any rollcall votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1260

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, this week is Indy 500 Week in the State of Indiana. For these 7 days, Hoosiers will be swept up in the pageantry and the tradition of the Greatest Spectacle in Racing. Every minute this week is leading toward the moment when the white flag comes out, signifying the final lap, when the drivers make one last push toward the finish line.

I couldn't help but think about this annual tradition as we enter the home stretch on the Endless Frontier Act in the coming days. The legislation has evolved and improved and grown over the last few months. We now know it as the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, but as we head into this week, I thought it important to reset and refocus on why we began this journey in the first place.

For me, it began back in 2019, in the gym of all places, where one morning, Senator SCHUMER and I began talking about the need to go on offense against the Chinese Communist Party. Since the Cold War, Beijing has aimed to overtake America, not with weapons but through innovation, through economic growth. Through Made in China 2025, Beijing set out with a deliberate plan to dominate the world through strategic investments and emerging technologies, all of which have the potential to fundamentally change this century's economic and security environment for good or for ill.

Until now, we have primarily focused on defensive countermeasures to thwart aggression by the Chinese Communist Party: blocking Huawei, imposing export controls, and improving foreign investment rules. Look, these priorities are really important, and they must remain part of the mix, but if

America is to lead the world in the 21st century, it is neither realistic nor practical to build an economic iron curtain around China. You see, just as we did in the 20th century, we must not simply contain our leading global competitor but, instead, outinnovate and outgrow it. We must go on offense.

The Endless Frontier Act was and is our effort to do just that, to make the kinds of research and science investments we haven't made for decades. We are creating a new Technology Directorate at the National Science Foundation and creating regional tech hubs to ensure we are leveraging the talents and abilities of Americans across the country, with the corresponding economic benefits reaching those in the heart of our country, not just those on the coasts.

This legislation will be a boost to our economy, but make no mistake—it is not just about the economy. This is about deciding which standards, which values are going to animate these new technologies in the future: the values we see cracking down on protesters in the streets of Hong Kong? the values that enslave millions of Uighurs in Xinjiang? our American values, which recognize that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights?

America is watching, and the free world is watching. All who are watching should be encouraged. You see, this body has largely embraced this objective. We have continued to go through the regular Senate order—an increasingly rare accomplishment in this body—of allowing each Member to offer amendments to improve this legislation. In fact, it was marked up in the Senate Commerce Committee and approved by a vote of 24 to 4. Last week, it came to the Senate floor, and we considered more amendments. This week, we will consider even more amendments.

As is typically the case in regular order, nobody gets everything he wants, including the bill's authors. As one example, through the markup process, less investment than I had originally proposed will now be provided to the NSF Tech Directorate, but that is OK. It is OK because this change and others are ones I can live with so that we can come together and prove that our system works while advancing a once-in-a-generation investment in science and technology.

We must send a message to the authoritarians in Beijing. They say we are too divided to lead the world in the 21st century. It is time to come together and prove them wrong.

As we Hoosiers say at the Indianapolis Motor Speedway, the white flag is out. This is the final lap for this bill in the U.S. Senate. I look forward to seeing this open process through to the finish line so that, together, we can outcompete, outinnovate, and outgrow the Chinese Communist Party.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator WYDEN and Senator SCHUMER may be able to complete our remarks before the vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1565

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on amendment No. 1565 to the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, or USICA, the underlying bill.

My amendment preserves the constitutional authority of Congress over international trade. It does so by ensuring the President cannot waive or modify congressionally approved trade agreements, including the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, or TRIPS—the TRIPS Agreement. And the reason is that the TRIPS Agreement, like the USICA, contains provisions that facilitate the leadership of the United States in scientific and technological innovation.

China is challenging that leadership through predatory practices aimed at our highest value sectors, including our pharmaceutical sector. Plain and simple, China wants our intellectual property.

Remarkably, the administration announced, without consulting Congress, that it would support a waiver of U.S. intellectual property rights under the TRIPS Agreement with respect to vaccines. Moreover, the U.S. Trade Representative declined to confirm that she would oppose letting this waiver extend to China.

Colleagues, there are vaccines precisely because the innovative U.S. firms exist because of strong IP protections. The problem with access to vaccines is not intellectual property. The problem is the manufacturing capacity.

This amendment I am proposing allows the administration to proceed, providing it is willing to make the case, including by presenting evidence and respecting Congress's authority. The outcome is subject to congressional approval, just like the original TRIPS Agreement.

I also demand real consultation with Congress. My colleague's amendment provides only that the administration will provide relevant proposals and pertinent documents to Congress related to the final agreement. There is no reason to grant this leeway to the administration given its existing failure to consult with us.

My amendment requires the administration to provide the text of any U.S. proposal to Congress 5 business days before it is tabled in a trade negotiation, not after it has agreed to amend a congressionally approved agreement.

With respect to that agreement and the other WTO agreements, we have spoken clearly as a body that the United States can withdraw from these agreements if, and only if, Congress passes a resolution to that effect.

For example, it requires reports on issues central to whether the administration's decision makes sense and provides for consultation by the administration with the public and Congress concerning its proposal. This will facilitate transparency, identify any national security risks presented by the administration's proposal, and, importantly, will stop an action that does not further vaccine access or present a risk to our national security.

Accordingly, if the administration's proposal is determined by the administration's own Agencies not to present a risk to U.S. national security and that it positively facilitates vaccine access, the administration may continue negotiating and seeking an outcome for a waiver.

It must not be the case that once Congress approves a trade agreement, the administration can simply withdraw rights or obligations under a congressionally approved trade agreement or alter its terms however it sees fit. Yet that is exactly what the administration is seeking to do here.

If we were to accept that proposition, what is the point for Congress's approving any future trade agreement if the administration can simply alter it without again coming to Congress to make that change?

This amendment ensures that the administration's proposal will, in fact, get a vote by applying fast-track-like procedures to its conclusions. It also prohibits our IP from going to China or Russia.

I have only one redline, which I suspect all of you share: The administration may not waive U.S. IP rights under the TRIPS Agreement to China and Russia. Congress approved the entry of these two countries into the WTO precisely because we wanted to hold them accountable to WTO rules.

Russia and China are a threat to American innovation and the principle reason why the USICA is before us on the floor of the Senate today. So why would we then allow the administration to legally bless their malfeasance?

If we must stand together and waive the IP rights of Americans, the least we can do is insist that China and Russia, which tout the successes of their own vaccines, not be allowed to take hard-earned U.S. technology.

This concern is particularly valid since the Chinese Government is actively trying to steal mRNA technology, and its efforts to develop such technology is led, in fact, by an arm of the Chinese military.

USICA is a sincere, bipartisan effort to promote American innovation in the face of China's predations. My amendment complements that effort and must likewise be considered.

I encourage all of my Democrat and Republican colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1975

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, Senator CRAPO has brought forward an amendment to the competition bill. It deals with the Biden administration's announcement that it

would participate in negotiations on intellectual property and the coronavirus vaccines.

Unfortunately, my friend's amendment also goes far beyond the current pandemic and adds roadblocks to any improvements to any other trade agreements into the future. So I must oppose Senator CRAPO's amendment.

I am offering an alternative, which the Senate will also vote on shortly. The fact is that even though COVID is receding in many American communities, the virus will still be a danger to Americans as long as there are outbreaks and mutations around the world.

That is a big reason why the Biden administration is working overtime to increase vaccine production and distribution as quickly as possible in our country and around the world. It is also why the administration announced its intention to participate in negotiations over the vaccine IP waivers. The U.S. Trade Representative will be in charge of our participation in those negotiations.

Again, unfortunately, the Crapo amendment would tie up our U.S. Trade Representative in bureaucratic redtape and reporting for many months before she could speak to any of our trading partners about the issue.

Ambassador Tai and the Biden administration recognize that the TRIPS waiver is not going to end the pandemic overnight. However, the American people and countries around the world cannot afford the delay that the Crapo amendment would cause.

The Crapo amendment puts the U.S. Trade Representative into what amounts to a straitjacket, making it hard—if not impossible—to negotiate fixes or modifications to any trade agreement, for any reason. It would make the process for modifying an agreement more difficult than getting into that agreement in the first place. That is a big roadblock to improvements that could raise standards for workers and the environment.

I will close by mentioning that I have filed an alternative, amendment 1975. My amendment guarantees transparency and consultations throughout the negotiations. It makes clear that the United States must promote global access to vaccines, all while safeguarding our IP from hostile foreign powers and protecting American innovation.

So here is the bottom line: It is not only possible, it is absolutely essential for our system to include strong intellectual property protections, as well as exceptions to promote the common good at the same time.

My amendment strikes the right balance. The Crapo amendment just goes too far in the direction of blocking the administration from using all available tools to fight the pandemic and to make improvements to any other trade agreements.

For that reason, I urge Senators to support my amendment, 1975. I urge my colleagues to oppose my friend's amendment, the Crapo amendment, and that will be the next vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all votes after the first be 10 minutes in length, and we are going to try to stick to it as best we can. So please, Members, we are trying to finish. We have six votes. We are trying to get them done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1975

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to the Wyden amendment, No. 1975.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 204 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

Kennedy

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). On this vote, the yeas are 50, and the nays are 49.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The amendment (No. 1975) was rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1565

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now appears on the Crapo amendment, No. 1565.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields back his time.

Mr. WYDEN. I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator WYDEN yields back the majority time.

All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the Crapo amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 205 Leg.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—1

Kennedy

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The amendment (No. 1565) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2003 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1502

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided,

prior to the vote in relation to the Paul amendment No. 2003.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, we may never know whether the pandemic arose from the lab in Wuhan, but we do know that so far no intermediate animal host has been discovered. Thousands of animals at the wet market have been looked at. None of them have carried COVID–19. We have tried to infect COVID–19 into bats. It doesn't grow well in bats. It seems most adapted and suitable for humans. We may not know whether this ever arose out of a Wuhan lab, but I think gain-of-function research, where we take a deadly virus, sometimes much more deadly than COVID, and then we increase its transmissibility to mammals is wrong.

In 2014, NIH stopped all of this research. I am using the same definition to say any gain-of-function research should not be funded in China with U.S. taxpayer dollars. I recommend a ''yes'' vote.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2003

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote requirement for this amendment and yield back time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

It seems as if the ayes have it.

(Applause.)

The amendment (No. 2003) was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. Let's hear it for RAND PAUL for passing an amendment unanimously.

AMENDMENT NO. 1507 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1502

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the Ernst amendment No. 1507.

The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, for years prior to the COVID pandemic, U.S. taxpayer dollars were being funneled into Communist China's state-run Wuhan Institute of Virology.

After COVID appeared in the vicinity of the Wuhan Institute, instead of cooperating with efforts to discover the source of the outbreak, Chinese officials instead ordered the destruction of some of the coronavirus samples and blocked access to the lab.

China continues to obstruct international efforts to discover the origins of COVID, refusing to allow independent scientists to review the database of coronaviruses that were being studied in the Wuhan Institute.

Providing additional U.S. funds to subsidize any state-run lab in China, especially the Wuhan Institute of Virology, goes against the very purpose of the underlying bill, which is to support more research in the United States to better compete with China.

My amendment would assure that not another dime of taxpayer dollars goes to subsidizing Communist China.

With that, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

VCOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1507

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote requirement for this amendment, and I yield back time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1507) was agreed to.

(Applause.)

AMENDMENT NO. 1787 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1502

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the consideration of the Daines amendment No. 1787.

Senator DAINES.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this amendment is called the Protecting IP Act. It is a bipartisan amendment that will help increase enforcement of the United States and China phase one trade deal.

This deal put in place important protections for America's intellectual property, the research inventions, copyrights, and more.

China has been a notorious and serial abuser of American intellectual property for decades, and that is why the phase one deal put in place a number of important safeguards. Unfortunately, China has not lived up to their end of the deal. It is critical that we hold China accountable for its commitments.

As we debate increasing investment in advanced research, we cannot look the other way and allow China to continue to steal American intellectual property. That is why I introduced this bipartisan Protecting IP amendment with Senator CORTEZ MASTO, to ensure the President and the USTR uses all available tools to enforce the phase one agreement.

We are in a race against China and must remain globally competitive. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense and bipartisan agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1787

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote requirement for this amendment and yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1787) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1891 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1502

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the vote in relation to the Lee amendment No. 1891.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 2 minutes.

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

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, all human lives from conception to natural birth have innate, immeasurable dignity and worth. They are not play things. They are not mere objects for scientific experimentation.

Experiments that use aborted fetal tissue and practices that create and destroy human embryos or human lives in their earliest stages of development flatly deny that truth. Unfortunately, our own tax dollars sometimes incentivize experiments of this very kind. And the bill before us provides no exceptions, no protections to prevent it.

The Endless Frontier Act includes over $80 billion of authorized funding for key areas of biotechnology, medical technology, genomics, and synthetic biology without any ethical guardrails or protections for the earliest stages of life.

Many Americans do not want to see their taxpayer dollars used to destroy, experiment on, or unethically alter human life, and they shouldn't be forced to do so.

Now, thankfully, there are some of these protections in annual appropriations measures that go through the Department of Health and Human Services. And they have been there for decades, but because this bill expands research at the NSF, the Department of Commerce, and the Office of Science and Technology, which are funded through a different appropriations bill through CJS, the HHS riders do not apply.

That is why I am offering this amendment, which would simply prohibit any research funded through the Endless Frontier Act from using fetal tissue obtained from an abortion and creating, destroying, discarding or putting human embryos at risk.

While the NSF currently has an Agency policy that bans research in which a human embryo is created or destroyed, this would codify that. We need it to codify that. We need this to be consistent with what we do elsewhere to protect the sanctity of human life.

Look, human lives at every stage are too precious to tinker with. Our research and laws should uphold this truth. This amendment would help ensure permanent protections to do precisely that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this bill is an important opportunity for Congress to put partisanship aside and help families in our country by boosting American competitiveness. This means making sure American research is guided by science, not by ideology.

Unfortunately, with this amendment, the Senator is doing the exact opposite. This amendment says, loud and

clear, that even during a pandemic, supporters will put ideology ahead of science and ahead of patients' health and gladly undermine the same type of research that helped develop new therapies for COVID–19.

This is an irresponsible, ideological attack on science and medical research. And it not only undermines doctors and researchers and patients' healthcare, it also undermines the goal of this whole bill, which is to boost American innovation and competitiveness. I urge a ''no'' vote.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1891

Mr. LEE. I call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Leg.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—51

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

NOT VOTING—1

Kennedy

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1891) was rejected.

The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1520

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise tonight to once again call for this entire body to have the opportunity to consider the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act. This would ensure that people in the military who have been subjected to sexual assault and other serious crimes get the justice they deserve.

I first introduced this legislation in 2013. Since then, the committee has had 8 years to consider it, to ask questions, to pursue changes, and to implement alternative solutions, and we have. In fact, over the period of 15 years, the committee enacted nearly 250 legislative provisions designed to address the scourge of sexual assault in the military. We have modified data reporting requirements. We have added questions to surveys. We have required annual reports on the status of sex offense investigations. We have required developments of strategies to hold leadership accountable. We have chartered special panels, commissions, and advisory committees to address this problem, and we have enacted their recommendations.

We have made scores of small adjustments, and they have just not moved the needle. The most recent annual report from the Department of Defense proves it. Reports of sexual assault have increased virtually every single year and remain at record highs, while prosecution and conviction rates have declined. The current system is not working. We need real reform, and we have the legislation to do it.

In 2014, I asked for a vote on this bill, and it earned majority support—55 votes—but it was filibustered. In 2015, again I earned majority support, but it was filibustered. I asked for a vote in 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, and I was denied every single time.

I am again asking on behalf of servicemembers who do so much for this country, who will sacrifice themselves and their lives for this Nation, and on behalf of the bipartisan, filibuster-proof majority of Senators who support this legislation and want to enact this reform, and this vote is being denied again.

How long must our servicemembers wait for real reform? How long must they wait for a criminal justice system that is worthy of their sacrifice? There is no persuasive argument for the need to allow more time to consider this legislation in committee. The committee has had nearly a decade to consider it. Most Members of this body have had years to consider it, and those who have had the least time to consider it, our newest Members, have already seen the need for reform. Nine out of ten new Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, including the two new members of the Armed Services Committee, have already cosponsored this bill.

This bill is now supported by 64 bipartisan Senators who deserve to have the opportunity to cast a vote for this important bill. We don't have to take the time for another incremental step. It is time to bring this vote to the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1520 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that there be 2 hours for debate equally divided in the usual form; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the reasons that I articulated last evening, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I continue to advocate for the ability of this body to vote up or down on this bill. This is an important moment in our Nation's history. This is a generational change whose time has come.

Previously, when such important reforms were needed, such as the don't ask, don't tell repeal, they were brought directly to the floor. It is time to bring this to the floor.

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1921 TULSA RACE MASSACRE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 234, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 234) recognizing the 100th Anniversary of the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 234) was agreed to.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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 preamble was agreed to.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, next week is a summer anniversary, 100 years since the Tulsa massacre. Before 1921, Greenwood District, also known as Black Wall Street, was a vibrant, thriving, prosperous Black community. But then, on the evening of May 31 into the early morning of June 1, 1921, there was a horrific massacre where hundreds of Black Tulsans were murdered and thousands were made homeless overnight. It was awful.

But as terrible as it was, that is why it is important to come together to honor the victims and their families and share their stories today with future generations. I am honored to cosponsor Senator LANKFORD's resolution today to remember this anniversary.

Together, we can all work to lift up the story of Black Wall Street and use this anniversary to remember, reflect, and work, as we do every day, toward reconciliation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, Senator INHOFE and I and this body have just passed by voice vote a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre. It is a significant resolution not only to be able to recall what happened in that terrible time in 1921 but to also recognize the 13 Black towns that still remain in Oklahoma.

It is an interesting history that we have in Oklahoma, and I encourage folks to be able to find out more about us as a State. From the late 1800s to the early 1900s, Black individuals and families from all over the South were fleeing away from where they were being oppressed, and they were coming to Oklahoma, setting up vibrant communities. Over 50 all-Black towns rose up in Oklahoma.

In fact, there was some dialogue in the early 1900s about possibly having Oklahoma be an all-Black State even. These Black communities were rising up around our State looking for opportunities, freedom, and a chance for a better life. Thirteen of those fifty towns still remain today as communities. Many of the individuals in these towns are friends and people whom I know and Senator INHOFE and I have the honor of being able to represent in this great body.

I think about Dr. Donnie Nero, Sr. He is the President of the African American Educators Hall of Fame. He is the one who helped found and pull this all together. He has an attitude in wonderful Clearview, OK, and he says: ''One of the greatest motivational concepts accessible to mankind is 'Recognition.''' He says recognition is about remembrance and acknowledgment.

We are taking a moment as a Senate today to be able to acknowledge these 13 Black towns that still remain in Oklahoma and to be able to look at some of the history of what happened during that time period. So let me walk through this somewhat.

Tullahassee was founded in 1883. It is regarded as one of the oldest surviving historically Black towns in Indian Territory.

Langston, founded in 1890, and was named after John Mercer Langston, an African-American educator and U.S. Representative from Virginia. Seven years later, the Oklahoma Territorial Legislature established the Colored Agricultural and Normal University, which would later be called Langston University. This historically Black college and university has grown from 41 students in 1897 to over 3,000 students today. Prominent Oklahomans such as Melvin Tolson, Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher, Clara Luper, E. Melvin Porter, Frederick Moon, Marques Haynes, Zelia Breaux, Isaac W. Young, Inman Page, and Zella Black Patterson all resided in the town of Langston or called Langston University home.

Tatums was founded in 1895. It was named after brothers Lee B. Tatum and Eldridge ''Doc'' Tatum. They found prosperity in 1929 when oil wells were drilled in Tatum. Norman Studios even filmed a silent movie called ''Black Gold,'' using the brothers in their film.

Taft was founded in 1902 on land allotted to Creek Freedman. They changed their name from Twine, which they were originally, to Taft to honor the then Secretary of War and later President William Howard Taft.

Grayson was bustling with five general stores, two blacksmiths, two drug stores, a cotton gin and a physician shortly after it was founded in 1902. It was originally known as Wildcat. It was changed in 1909 to honor the Creek chief, George W. Grayson.

Boley was a town established in 1903 and named after J.B. Boley, a railroad official of the Fort Smith and Western Railway, and grew to be the largest African-American town in Oklahoma. Only 5 years after being founded, Booker T. Washington visited the town and wrote about the prosperity that he had witnessed. Boasting the first Black-owned bank, the First National Bank of Boley was owned by D.J. Turner. It received a national charter and rose to be one of the largest and wealthiest exclusively Black communities. Today, Boley still hosts the Nation's oldest annual Black rodeo.

Rentiesville, founded in 1903, was developed on 40 acres owned by William Rentie and Phoebe McIntosh. The Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway developed a flag stop, putting Rentiesville on the map. John Hope Franklin, a scholar of African-American history who promoted dialogue that reshaped American views on race relations, was born in Rentiesville in 1915. The Franklins later moved to Tulsa, where John Hope Franklin graduated from Booker T. Washington. He survived the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre, and he went on to become one of the most decorated historians. He inspired the John Hope Franklin Center for Reconciliation, Reconciliation Park in Tulsa, and an elementary school in North Tulsa. Rentiesville continues to host the Dusk Til' Dawn Blues Festival that attracts blues artists and all the folks who come in.

Clearview, a town I have already mentioned, was founded in 1903 along the tracks of the Fort Smith and Western Railroad, was widely known for its baseball team, but it is widely known now for the Hall of Fame for Black Educators. It is a place that I would encourage people to be able to stop in and to be able to see. And it is an annual tradition where individuals from around the State ride in to be able to recognize Black educators to be recognized that year in the Hall of Fame ceremony led by Dr. Nero, Sr.

Brooksville, founded in 1903, originally named Sewell, was renamed in 1912 in honor of the first African American in the area, A.R. Brooks.

Red Bird, founded in 1907 along the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railroad, was built on the land allotted by the Creek Nation. E.L. Barber was one of the town's original developers and the first justice of the peace and an early mayor. Before Red Bird officially became a town, Barber organized the First Baptist Church in 1889, which grew to be the largest church in Red Bird.

Summit was founded in 1910 along the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway.

Vernon was founded in 1911 on Tankard Ranch in the Creek Nation and was home to many trailblazers such as Ella Woods, who was the first Postmaster, and Louise Wesley, who established the first school and church.

Lima, founded in 1913 along the Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific Railroad. The Mount Zion Methodist Church was built in 1915 and still stands to this day.

And, of course, the most famous and prosperous of all of the Black communities was Greenwood. Greenwood District became a thriving community where Black business owners, schools, and churches flourished. By the late 1910s, it was the wealthiest Black community in all of the United States. The community earned the name ''Black Wall Street'' from the famed African-American author and educator I already spoke of, Booker T. Washington.

The history of these historically Black towns is interwoven into the history of Oklahoma and the history of the United States. The residents of these towns have achieved great success and faced tremendous challenges. The stories of these Black towns and communities in Oklahoma are also inextricably linked to the events of May 30 through June 1 of 1921, when the Greenwood District in North Tulsa burst into flames.

An important part of history is learning from the past. It is not looking at an incident in isolation. It is what came before and after. This weekend, the Nation will pause and reflect on the 100th anniversary of the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre, the worst race

massacre in the history of the United States.

But we can't look at Greenwood as if it was a single weekend. It was a prosperous, thriving Black community. And it still has a history to be able to share in our future.

Maybe you have heard me share the story on the floor of the Senate before. In the past several years, I talked about the race massacre, here in committee meetings and in conversations around this body. There is a significance of the 100th anniversary, not just for Tulsa and my State, but for the rest of the Nation as well. So let me recount this again.

On May 30, 1921, a young Black man named Dick Rowland was in downtown Tulsa. He entered the Drexel Building to use the only bathroom in the area that was available for Black people to be able to use in downtown Tulsa.

An incident occurred in the elevator between Dick Rowland and Sarah Paige, and Sarah Paige screamed. We really don't know what happened there, but as the doors opened, she screamed. The police did an investigation and the next day they went to Dick Rowland and they detained him at the Tulsa Police Department for questioning before removing him to the Tulsa Courthouse to be able to be confined.

On May 31, 1921, the Tulsa Tribune released a sensationalist story claiming that a young Black man had attacked a White girl in an elevator in the Drexel Building. That story and long, simmering tensions in the city led to a large group of White individuals surrounding the courthouse to demand that Dick Rowland be released so he could be lynched.

A group of Black men traveled to the courthouse to help defend Dick Rowland from the angry mob, many of them veterans from World War I who had served honorably there.

After a scuffle at the downtown Tulsa courthouse, White rioters pursued the men back to the Greenwood District and the violence escalated dramatically. Literally, as the violence increased, the White rioters that really became a mob were deputized to be able to handle the issues in Greenwood. They gathered firearms as they ran the few blocks from central downtown Tulsa into Greenwood just north of Tulsa.

Houses and businesses were burned and looted throughout the Greenwood District, and the attacks lasted well into the night and well into the next day before being quelled by the Oklahoma City National Guard. In less than 24 hours, 35 city blocks were destroyed by fires, 6,000 African American individuals were detained, and up to 300 lives were lost.

Out of the 23 churches that were located in the Greenwood area prior to the 1921 massacre, only 13 of the churches survived and only three churches were able to be rebuilt after being destroyed—Paradise Baptist Church, Mount Zion Baptist Church, and Vernon AME Church.

It was a horrific day, and 100 years later, the residents and businesses in the Greenwood District still carry on the legacy of resilience and determination.

For the past few years, I have been working to tell this story. For some—even some Oklahomans—it is a story that they had not heard before. Five years ago, I started telling the story in Washington, DC, and when I told it, hardly anyone knew about it. Now everyone I speak to is familiar with the story.

We have pulled this story out of the dark ages of history and lifted it up for our Nation to be able to see and our Nation is looking at it. In Oklahoma, many people now know about that terrible 2-day period when rioters set a community on fire and set our Nation back. But I also tell people that you can't understand Tulsa and Oklahoma unless you understand May 31 and June 1 of 1921.

So I worked to develop a curriculum to ensure future generations of Oklahomans learn the accurate historic events of 1921. Before we started working on the curriculum, our schools had a mandate to teach the 1921 massacre. But there were no materials to actually use to teach that accurate history. There were no visuals. There was no curriculum. Now there are. We pulled all those together and made that resource free to every educator in Oklahoma and every educator in America that wants to be able to teach that history accurately.

During this same time period, 5 or 6 years ago, I started working on something I called Solution Sundays, because when I started speaking about 6 years ago now to individuals all around Tulsa and around the State about the Tulsa Race Massacre, I usually started the conversation the same way: May 31 and June 1 of 2021, I would say, about 6 years ago, the entire country is going to pause. I don't know how long. They may pause for a minute. They may pause for an hour. They may pause for a day or for a weekend.

But the entire country will pause and will look at Tulsa and look at Oklahoma and will ask themselves one question: What has changed in America in race relations in the last 100 years? I said 6 years ago, that is a fair question for someone to ask; we had better be able to answer it when May 31 of 2021 comes.

Little did I know 6 years ago, when I started asking that question and continued to ask that question when it was 5 years, 4 years, 3 years, 2 years, and the next year—little did I know—about the events dealing with race that would happen in the last 12 months and the awakening that in the Nation really has happened to what is still left undone in the issue of race in America.

I started something about 6 years ago. At this same time, I started asking about what would we say. I started challenging families with something I called Solution Sundays. It is a simple idea, quite frankly. I would just ask people that I would encounter, of all races, of all backgrounds, a simple question: Has your family ever invited a family of another race to your home for dinner?

I thought it was simple until, when I would ask people, I would get the same answer back. I would ask people: Has your family ever invited a family of another race to your home for dinner?

And the most common answer I got back was: I have friends of another race.

To which I would always smile and say: That is not what I asked. I asked: Has your family ever invited a family of another race to your home for dinner?

And what I found in my State was that most individuals of every race all answered it the same way: That has never happened in my house.

So I would ask them a simple question. A national conversation about race is not something that happens on TV. A national conversation on race happens at our dinner tables with our families.

We should not expect that the Nation will speak on race when our families are not. And the best way for our families and to show our kids that this is normal conversation is to have a family over of another race to sit around the table.

What I like to say to people is, we will never get all the issues of race on the table until we get our feet under the same table and just talk and just get to know each other as friends. The Nation will not shift on race relations until each of our families shifts on race relations.

I continue to be able to challenge this simple concept of Solution Sundays. By the way, if you want to pick a different day, that is fine with me. But Sunday seems to be a pretty good day just to invite someone over for dinner or for lunch.

In just a few days, people from all over the country will fly into Tulsa, some of them for the first time. They are going to participate in events to commemorate the hundredth anniversary. It is my hope that what they see will be a model of reconciliation for the rest of the country. But after the anniversary passes and the crowds leave and the national folks will go on to doing something else, we will still be around. Tulsa and all of Oklahoma will still need to finish the work that has begun on race.

I will still be around North Tulsa. I have lots of friends there. And I know there will be an ongoing dialogue, still, about reconciliation because the big event that the whole world turns the television cameras on for doesn't solve the issues of race. We solve that as individuals and as a family.

You see, I believe, like many do, that I have a calling toward reconciliation. As a follower of Jesus, as I read

through the New Testament, I bump into passages like Second Corinthians, chapter 5, where Paul wrote to us and said we have the ministry and the message of reconciliation.

Now, I understand that Paul first meant that was an ability to be able to come to God and be reconciled to God. And I do believe firmly that every individual can be reconciled with God, and I am glad to share that message of ministry. But I also believe it is a challenge to each of us to work toward reconciliation. Where relationships are broken, we are the reconcilers, and we have a ministry and a message of reconciliation.

My friend Robert Turner is the pastor of Vernon A.M.E. Church, in the heart of Greenwood. He and I were visiting last week on the phone, talking through the things coming up in the days ahead. As I was chitchatting with my friend, he said: I have to tell you about my sermon that I preached a couple of weeks ago.

So I said: Tell me all about it.

Pastor Turner said: I preached on Matthew, the tax collector, also called Levi.

And we spent some time talking about that.

And he said: What I told my congregation was that Jesus called Matthew, the tax collector, to be one of his disciples, but he also called Simon the Zealot to be one of his disciples.

Now, you may not know, but the tax collectors were loyal to the Romans. They were Jews who were loyal to the Roman authority, and the zealots were Jews who were adamantly opposed to the Roman authority. So, literally, Jesus grabbed two people from opposite political perspectives—opposite, if I can say it, political parties—and he grabbed both of them and said: I want you to be my disciple.

And Pastor Turner said: There is a lot that we can learn from Jesus, beginning with what Jesus said: Everyone is welcome, from every political perspective, to come and follow Him.

Pastor Turner, you are spot on. My friend, keep preaching it. But excuse me for noticing, Jesus is the one who set the example, and he called all of us to be able to follow it.

Now, I have to tell you, Pastor Turner and I don't agree on everything. We may not even vote alike, though, honestly, I have never asked him how he votes. But he is my friend, and he is my partner of reconciliation.

For 6 years, I have asked people across Oklahoma, when May the 31st comes and the Nation stops and asks, ''What has changed in the last 100 years?'' We should be prepared to answer. That weekend is here, and each of us should be able to answer that for our lives and for our families.

Let's finish the work. We are not done on racial reconciliation. Let's finish the work, starting with our own families, our own communities, and our own lives.

God help us to carry on the ministry and the message of reconciliation.

With that, I yield the floor.

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, before I begin, let me just say a word of thanks to my two colleagues from Oklahoma for this moment that we have had on the Senate floor.

I was privileged to be waiting to give my remarks to hear them speak, and I thought this was a wonderful moment. We have our challenges around here, but if we had more moments like this, we would get through our challenges better. I congratulate and thank both of my colleagues.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Madam President, there is a scheme afoot, a scheme I will be talking about in weeks ahead—a long-running, right-wing scheme to capture the Supreme Court.

Special interests are behind the scheme. They control it through dark money—hundreds of millions of dollars in anonymous hidden spending. We will dwell in later speeches on how the scheme operates.

This first speech seeks its origins. The scheme is secret, and because of its secrecy, it is hard to know exactly where the story should begin.

The one place you could begin is with a corporate lawyer—the Virginian Lewis Powell. An authorized biography of Lewis Powell by his fellow Virginian, renowned UVA law professor John Jeffries, reveals Powell to be a tough and incisive lawyer, willing and able to make sharp, even harsh, decisions, but a man of courtly and decent matters, well settled in the White male social and corporate elite of Richmond, VA. There he developed his legal and business career through the 1950s and 1960s.

A successful corporate law practice often entailed joining corporate boards. Richmond was a home to Big Tobacco, and Powell's legal career led him on to Richmond's tobacco and other corporate boards.

Richmond was Virginia's sibling rival to Charlottesville, which could boast of Thomas Jefferson's nearby Monticello, his renowned University of Virginia, and all the cultural and academic vibrancy bubbling around that great university. Richmond—Richmond was the working sibling, hosting the State's capitol and its political offices and serving as its corporate center.

Powell was an ambitious Richmond corporate lawyer, and the turbulence of the 1960s was broadly distressing to America's corporate elite. The civil rights movement disrupted Jim Crow across the South, drawing out and exposing to the Nation the racist violence that had long enforced the social and legal norm of segregation and upsetting America's all-White corporate suites and boardrooms.

Anti-war protesters derided Dow Chemical Company's manufacture of napalm and scorned the entire military-industrial complex. Women's rights protesters challenged all-male corporate management structures. The environmental movement protested chemical leaks, toxic products, and the poisons belching from corporate smokestacks. Public health groups began linking the tobacco industry to deadly illnesses, and lead paint companies to brain damage in children.

Ralph Nader criticized America's car companies for making automobiles that were ''Unsafe at Any Speed'' and causing carnage on America's highways. America's anxious corporate elite saw Congress respond with new and unwelcome laws and saw courts respond with big and unwelcome verdicts. Something had to be done.

Powell's prominence in Virginia's civic, legal, social, and corporate circles had brought him attention in Washington, DC. And a new client of his, the Washington, DC-based U.S. Chamber of Commerce, asked Powell for his help. The Chamber commissioned from Powell a secret report, a strategic plan for reasserting corporate authority over the political arena.

The secret Powell report, titled ''Attack on American Free Enterprise System,'' was telling. It was telling, first, for the apocalyptic certainty of its tone. Powell's opening sentence was: ''No thoughtful person can question that the American system is under broad attack.'' By that, he meant the American economic system, but that assertion was footnoted with the parallel assertion that—and I am quoting him again—''The American political system of democracy under the rule of law is also under attack.''

This was, Powell asserted, ''quite new in [American history].''

''Business and the enterprise system are in deep trouble,'' he wrote, ''and the hour is late.''

The secret Powell report was an alarm.

The report is populated with liberal bogeymen: the bombastic lawyer William Kunstler; the popular author of ''The Greening of America,'' Charles Reich; the consumer advocate Ralph Nader, whom Powell said there should be, and I am quoting here, ''no hesitation to attack.''

Against them, Powell set establishment defenders like columnist Stewart Alsop and conservative economist Milton Friedman. Powell cloaked the concerns of corporate America as concerns of ''individual freedom,'' a rhetorical framework for corporate political power that persists to this day.

The battle lines were drawn. Indeed, the language in the Powell report is the language of battle: ''attack,'' ''frontal assault,'' ''rifle shots,'' ''warfare.'' The recommendations are to end compromise and appeasement—his words: ''compromise'' and ''appeasement''—to understand that, as he said, ''the ultimate issue may be survival''—and he underlined the word ''survival''

in his report—and to call for ''the wisdom, ingenuity and resources of American business to be marshaled against those who would destroy it.''

Well, for this, you had to have a plan, and the Powell plan was to go big. Here is what he said:

''Strength lies in organization, in careful long-range planning and implementation, in consistency of action over an indefinite period of years, in the scale of financing available only through joint effort, and in the political power available only through united action and national organizations.''

Powell recommended a propaganda effort staffed with scholars and speakers, a propaganda effort to which American business should devote ''10 percent of its total advertising budget,'' including an effort to review and critique textbooks, especially in economics, political science, and sociology.

''National television networks should be monitored in the same way that textbooks should be kept under constant surveillance,'' he said. Corporate America should aggressively insist on the right to be heard, on ''equal time,'' and corporate America should be ready to deploy, and I am quoting him here, ''whatever degree of pressure—publicly and privately—may be necessary.'' This would be ''a long road,'' Powell warned, ''and not for the fainthearted.''

In his section entitled ''The Neglected Political Arena,'' Powell recommended using political influence to stem ''the stampedes by politicians to support any legislation related to 'consumerism' or to the 'environment.''' And, yes, Powell put the word ''environment'' in derogatory quote marks in the original.

''Political power,'' Powell wrote, ''is necessary; . . . [it] must be assiduously cultivated; and . . . when necessary . . . must be used aggressively and with determination.'' He concluded that ''it is essential [to] be far more aggressive than in the past,'' with ''no hesitation to attack,'' ''not the slightest hesitation to press vigorously in all political arenas,'' and no ''reluctance to penalize politically those who oppose'' the corporate effort. In a nutshell, no holds barred.

And then came the section of the secret report that may have launched the scheme to capture the court. It is called ''Neglected Opportunity in the Courts.'' This section focused on what Powell called ''exploiting judicial action.'' He called it an ''area of vast opportunity.''

He wrote: ''Under our constitutional system, especially with an activist-minded Supreme Court''—I will intervene to say, of course, we have today, as a result of the scheme, the most activist-minded Supreme Court in American history, but back to his quote—''especially with an activist-minded Supreme Court, the judiciary may be the most important instrument for social, economic and political change.''

Powell urged that the Chamber of Commerce become the voice of American business in the courts, with a ''highly competent staff of lawyers,'' if ''business is willing to provide the funds.'' He concludes: ''The opportunity merits the necessary effort.''

The secret report may well have been the single most consequential piece of writing that Lewis Powell ever did in a long career of consequential writings. The tone and content of the report actually explain a lot of decisions in his future career. Yet this secret report received no attention—not even a passing mention—in Professor Jeffries' detailed, authoritative, and authorized Powell biography.

The secret chamber report was not disclosed to the U.S. Senate in Senate confirmation proceedings when, shortly after delivering his secret report to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Lewis Powell was nominated to the U.S. Supreme Court by President Richard Nixon.

The secret report was dated August 23, 1971. Two months later, on October 22, Nixon nominated Powell to the Supreme Court. Lewis Powell was sworn in as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court on January 7, 1972, less than 6 months after this secret report was delivered to the chamber.

To be continued.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

SAFEGUARDING AMERICAN INNOVATION ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I rise today in strong support of the Safeguarding American Innovation Act. This is legislation that has been included in the substitute amendment to the bill we are working on this week, called the Endless Frontier Act, or as it has now been called, the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act.

Well, if our goal is to increase U.S. competitiveness and encourage more U.S. innovation, we have to not only invest in research and innovation, we have to be sure that we are keeping our investment in research and intellectual property from being taken by our competitors and used against us. That is what this legislation does.

By the way, that is just common sense, or so you would think, but that is not what we found during a bipartisan investigation during the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Instead, during a yearlong inquiry, we uncovered that our government and our research institutions over the last couple of decades have permitted China to take advantage of a lax U.S. approach to safeguarding our taxpayer-funded innovation, be it in our college campuses or in our research labs, nor was law enforcement, principally the FBI, doing anything significant to combat this threat. In fact, at our hearing on the report about 18 months ago, the FBI admitted in sworn testimony that they have been asleep at the switch, essentially.

Our PSI investigation detailed the rampant theft of U.S. taxpayer-funded research and intellectual property by China by way of their so-called China recruitment programs, mainly the Thousand Talents Plan. China uses these plans to systematically find promising researchers and promising research that China is interested in, and they recruit those researchers.

These programs have not been subtle. The Thousand Talents Plan is perhaps the best understood of these programs, although there are actually a couple hundred of them. Our PSI investigation documented how the Thousand Talents Plan was used to target and steal taxpayer-funded research and IP for at least two decades in this country, and much of that research and innovation was taken from our labs to China and went directly into fueling the rise of the Chinese economy and the Chinese military.

While this is what China has done and continues to do, this is really about us. We have to get our own house in order. Specifically, we found that the Chinese Government has targeted promising U.S.-based research and researchers. Often, this research is funded by U.S. taxpayers. We spend about $150 billion a year on taxpayer-funded research in places like the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Energy for basic science research. And with this legislation we are talking about tonight on the floor, the Endless Frontier Act, we are talking about a huge increase in the amount of Federal spending for this kind of research.

The annual $150 billion that has gone out over the years has been a good investment of taxpayer dollars, I believe. Why? Because it has led to some amazing things, from cures for everything from viruses to particular kinds of cancer, to technologies that support our defense base, to manufacturing technology that has made us more efficient as a country. But it is not good if the U.S. taxpayer is paying for this good research, and then China is taking it to fuel their own economic and military rise.

China has not just stolen some of the research funded by U.S. taxpayers; China has actually paid these grant recipients to take their research over to China at Chinese universities—again, universities affiliated with the Chinese Communist Party. They have been very clever about it. They want to be sure that China is a stronger competitor against us, and they take the research delivered from the United States to what is referred to as shadow

labs in China, where they replicate the research.

Rather than pointing the finger at China, we ought to be looking at our own government and our own institutions and doing a better job with the things we can control. Again, let's get our own house in order. We have made some progress in doing that.

Following our November 2019 PSI investigation I talked about and the report we issued, in December of 2020, John Demers, the Assistant Attorney General for National Security and head of the Justice Department's China Initiative, announced that more than 1,000 researchers affiliated with China's military left the United States following a crackdown on recipients of taxpayer-funded Federal grants concealing their affiliation with China's Thousand Talents Program. One thousand researchers left the United States.

That news followed multiple guilty pleas and a string of arrests of academics affiliated with American universities for alleged crimes related to concealing their participation in China's talent recruitment programs while accepting American taxpayer funds and taking research to China.

After two decades of allowing this activity to go on, over the past 18 months, we have finally begun to crack down. In my own State of Ohio, in my home State, there have been some researchers who have been arrested. However, as our investigation found and law enforcement told us, the Federal Government is limited in the actions they can take under current law. It is our responsibility in Congress to change that.

All of the arrests in connection with the Thousand Talents Plan have been related to peripheral financial crimes, like wire fraud and tax evasion, not the core issue of the conflict of commitment, conflict of interest, the taking of American taxpayer research, and also taking money from China. Why? Because it is not currently a crime to knowingly hide foreign research funding on a Federal grant application, as an example. In other words, if you are performing research funded by the U.S. taxpayer and also being paid by China to do the same research, there is no law that states you have to disclose that funding from China. That is just wrong.

Since our report, the National Institutes of Health has started to require that that information be disclosed. The NIH is alone so far in requiring that. But even there, there is still no law requiring disclosure.

The arrests made since our PSI report have not been about that core issue of researchers hiding foreign funding from China and stealing our research. So we need to change the laws so we can give our law enforcement community the tools they need to go do the job that all of us expect is being done.

The Safeguarding American Innovation Act goes directly to the root of this problem and makes it punishable by law to knowingly fail to disclose foreign funding on Federal grant applications. While this is a criminal statute, it is really about transparency, which is a core tenet of the U.S. research enterprise.

Our bill also makes other important changes informed by our investigation. It requires the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, in the executive branch to streamline and coordinate grant-making between the Federal Agencies so there is more continuity, accountability, and coordination when it comes to tracking the billions of dollars of taxpayer-funded grant money that is being distributed.

Again, the underlying legislation here in the Chamber tonight is about more money going into research. Let's be sure that there is transparency and that we know how it is being distributed. We found in our investigation that this kind of coordination and transparency was sorely lacking and long overdue.

Our legislation also allows the Department of State to deny visas to foreign researchers coming to the United States who they know are going to exploit the openness of our research enterprise to acquire sensitive and emerging technologies against the national security interests of the United States and to benefit an adversarial foreign government.

This may surprise you, but the State Department can't do that now. It is a loophole in the law. In finalizing our language for the substitute, we worked very closely with career State Department employees, who were desperate to get this authority to keep, say, members from the People's Liberation Army, who are definitely connected with the Chinese military, from coming over here and attending conferences where sensitive, export controlled technology is being talked about and distributed.

Our bill also requires foreign institutions and universities to tell the State Department whether a foreign researcher will have access to export controlled technologies and also to demonstrate to the State Department that they have a plan to prevent unauthorized access to any export controlled technologies at the research institution.

That is really important. It seems like basic information that the State Department would get here, that would have been provided all along, but it hasn't been. Providing this information as part of the visa process should also help streamline the process for the State Department and for these research institutions. I think it is good for both to make sure that this is clear and we know what the rules are.

We also require increased transparency in reporting foreign gifts and contracts at our colleges and our universities. Those schools are now going to need to report any foreign gift or contract worth $50,000 or more. The current threshold is $250,000. More transparency is a good thing.

We also empower the Department of Education to work with these universities and research institutions to ensure that this can be complied with in a way that doesn't create undue red-tape and expenditures. That is not the idea. The idea is to have transparency but have it be something that is efficient. But we also allow the Department of Education for the first time to fine universities that repeatedly fail to disclose these gifts. We have actually found that about 70 percent of universities weren't following the current law, partly because there was no fine. There was really no accountability.

All of the changes that I have outlined are necessary to help keep America on the cutting edge. In order to be globally competitive, we have to be more effective at pushing back against the specific threat from China and from other nations, like Russia, Iran, and North Korea, looking to steal our research and our intellectual property.

Until we start to clean up our own house and take a firmer stance against foreign influences here in this country trying to take our research, we are going to keep losing the innovations that we create here, and we will be less competitive. That is why the Safeguarding American Innovation Act is so important to be included in this bill.

I will finish by noting that this has been truly a nonpartisan effort—not just bipartisan but nonpartisan—from the start. We wanted to ensure that, in a thoughtful, smart, and effective way, we were responding to the very real threat that we identified from China and other foreign adversaries.

I want to commend my partner in our PSI investigation and cosponsor of our legislation, Senator TOM CARPER. I also want to thank the Presiding Officer tonight for her role in this, for her contributions and her support. I also want to say that I appreciate Senators PETERS and SCHUMER and their staff for working with us to finalize the language, as well as the State Department and other officials from the Trump administration and the Biden administration who provided important assistance.

Safeguarding American innovation is always a good idea, but it is particularly important in the context of the legislation before us that provides exceptionally large amounts of Federal money for research to make us more competitive. I support that research, but I don't want the taxpayer funds to go in the front door and then to have the research go out the back door to China or other adversaries. That is not what this should be about, and thanks to this legislation being included in this law, I feel confident that it will not be about that.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

S. 1260

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in a moment, I will file cloture on both

the substitute amendment of the competition bill and on the motion to proceed to the House-passed legislation to create an independent commission to investigate and report on the attack of January 6, setting up a potential vote this week.

On the competition bill, this legislation is the product of at least half a dozen Senate committees, working for months—months—in a bipartisan way. That means that every single Member of the Senate has had their fingerprints on it in one manner or another.

The Senate has been making great progress so far this week. To borrow an expression that might appeal to my colleague and partner from Indiana, Senator YOUNG, we are approaching the final straightaway of the race. We have completed a very efficient series of votes on six amendments this afternoon, five of which were sponsored by Republicans. That is in addition to four amendment votes we have already held and literally dozens—dozens—of bipartisan amendments that were added to the bill before it even reached the floor.

This is regular order in action. Members on both sides have clamored that we bring bills to the floor, debate them, and ask for amendments. That is what is happening here. This is a bipartisan bill that came out of committees with overwhelming votes—21 to 1 in Foreign Relations and 22 to 4 in Commerce, with a lot of bipartisan input in both committees and throughout—and now we are debating it on the floor.

I believe the depth of bipartisanship on this bill reveals two things: one, just how much of a hunger there is on both sides of the aisle to tackle the issue of American leadership in the 21st century. It also shows a hunger to work in a bipartisan way, and we hope that our colleagues will understand that as we seek now to invoke cloture on the bill after we do several more amendments.

With the finish line in sight, we need to continue working together to see this bill through. As I said, we will consider a few more amendments tomorrow and Thursday, including a managers' amendment, before final passage. If both sides continue to work in good faith to schedule amendment votes, which has been the hallmark so far, there is no reason we can't finish the competition bill by the end of the week. And we will look for a signal from our Republican friends that, when we cooperate, we will move forward and not move to block or delay unnecessarily.

Now, of this bill, again, I cannot say how important it is to the future of America. Investing in science and innovation has been a hallmark of why this country has led the world in economic growth, in good-paying jobs, in creating a brighter, sunnier, happier America. Our failure to invest could lead to a real decline—a cloudiness over America and its future. We have to move forward, and that is why this bill has gotten such great support. This is not a minor bill. Just because there is not partisan fighting doesn't mean it is not one of the most important bills we have passed in a very long time, and we will look back in history and say that this was a moment when America got a grip back on itself and moved forward after several years of languishing, at best.

JANUARY 6 COMMISSION

I am also going to move to file cloture on the motion to proceed to the House-passed legislation to create an independent commission to investigate and report on the attack of January 6, setting up a potential vote this week. We all know the commission is an urgent, necessary idea to safeguard our democracy. What happened on January 6 was a travesty—a travesty. It risked America in ways we haven't seen in decades, maybe even in our history altogether.

In the wake of January 6, unfortunately, too many Republicans in both Chambers have been trying to rewrite history and sweep the despicable attack on our democracy under the rug. If people believe the Big Lie—if they believe that this election was not on the level, spread by the Big Lie of Donald Trump and his legions in the press—our democracy erodes. At the core of this democracy is the belief that we vote; the process is fair; and then whoever is fairly elected we respect as our leader. That has not happened for the first time in a long time.

I so respect our two Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle who say they will vote for this proposal. I hope many more will. We have to get it passed. Each Member of the Senate is going to have to stand up and decide: Are you on the side of truth and accountability or are you on the side of Donald Trump and the Big Lie?

We cannot let this lie fester. We must get at the truth. We must restore faith in this grand, wonderful, beautiful, evolving experiment—the greatest democracy that has ever been seen on Earth. We can't let that go away. By sweeping all of this under the rug and by having so many people believe the lies, we could see the Sun begin to set on America. I hope that doesn't happen. I pray that doesn't happen. I don't believe it will happen because I believe we will rise to the occasion and get at the truth.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Madam President, now I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 1260 on Wednesday, May 26, the following amendments be called up and reported by number: Durbin, 2014; Kennedy, 1710; Sullivan, 1911; further, that at 12 noon tomorrow, Wednesday, May 26, the Senate vote in relation to the Sullivan amendment and at 2:30 in relation to the Durbin and Kennedy amendments, with no amendments in order to these amendments prior to a vote in relation to the amendment, with 60 affirmative votes required for the adoption, with the exception of the Sullivan amendment, and 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Schumer substitute amendment No. 1502 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, Jacky Rosen, Patrick J. Leahy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Chris Van Hollen, Maria Cantwell, Mazie K. Hirono, Tammy Duckworth, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Luján.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on 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, Jacky Rosen, Patrick J. Leahy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Chris Van Hollen, Maria Cantwell, Mazie K. Hirono, Tammy Duckworth, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Luján.

NATIONAL COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6 ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL COMPLEX ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to H.R. 3233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 60, a bill (H.R. 3233) to establish the National Commission to Investigate the January 6 Attack on

the United States Capitol Complex, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 60, H.R. 3233, a bill to establish the National Commission to Investigate the January 6 Attack on the United States Capitol Complex, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Patrick J. Leahy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Mazie K. Hirono, Tammy Duckworth, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Luján.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 111.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Anton George Hajjar, of Maryland, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2023.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 111, Anton George Hajjar, of Maryland, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2023.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Jacky Rosen, Richard Blumenthal, Tina Smith, John Hickenlooper, Michael F. Bennet, Tim Kaine, Brian Schatz.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 134.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Eric S. Lander, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 134, Eric S. Lander, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Christopher A. Coons, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Mazie K. Hirono, Tammy Duckworth, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Luján.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate resume legislative session.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, Tuesday, May 25, be waived.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1260

Mr. SCHUMER. Notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for first degree amendments to S. 1260 be at 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 26.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I rise today in remembrance and recognition of the tremendous sacrifice of America's fallen military members who have given their life in service to our Nation and defense of our freedoms.

As we commemorate Memorial Day this year on Monday, May 31, we honor and remember the brave men and women whose lives have been lost in defense of the freedoms we hold dear. Without their incredible sacrifice, our Nation and the very ideals of democracy, freedom, and liberty we so proudly represent would not have endured.

On this occasion, as we express our Nation's gratitude to our fallen heroes, we remember the words written by President Abraham Lincoln to Mrs. Lydia Bixby following the loss of her five sons. In his letter, dated November 21, 1864, President Lincoln wrote, ''I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.''

Our Nation can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to these fallen heroes and their families. Each year, on Memorial Day, we pledge that their service and sacrifice will never be forgotten.

We also take this opportunity to thank the many men, women, and organizations that work every day to support our military and veteran community, as well as the families of fallen heroes. I especially would like to recognize the work of American Legion Post 135, in my hometown of Naples, FL. The work American Legion Post 135 and the many other veterans and military organizations do to support our families and communities is greatly appreciated.

I ask that all Floridians and all Americans join me today in pausing for a moment to reflect on the sacrifice of America's great heroes and all who have made the ultimate sacrifice in service to us and this great Nation.

REMEMBERING REAR ADMIRAL RICHARD T. BRENNAN, JR.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to honor RDML Richard T. Brennan, Jr., of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, Commissioned Corps, one of our Nation's eight uniformed services. Admiral Brennan most recently served as the Director of the Office of Coast Survey, one of America's oldest bureaus, created by Thomas Jefferson in 1807 to produce nautical charts to help the Nation with safe shipping, national defense, and maritime boundaries. Unfortunately, Admiral Brennan passed

away suddenly on May 13, 2021, due to complications from surgery. He was 52 years old.

Former leaders of the storied ''Survey of the Coast,'' going back to the first superintendent, Ferdinand R. Hassler, were either impeccable surveyors, expert scientists, ingenious engineers, master shiphandlers, intrepid explorers, or visionary risk-takers. With 27 years of diverse experience and a constant desire to learn more, Admiral Brennan embodied all of those qualities and more. He served on nearly every hydrographic ship in NOAA's fleet, surveying the East Coast, Caribbean territories, the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Coast into remote areas of Alaska, even mapping far into the Arctic Ocean to support the U.S.'s Law of the Sea claim. Whether discovering a new, uncharted seamount deep in the Chukchi Sea or uncovering the sunken remains of a lost locomotive tender car off the tidal banks of the Piscataqua River, Admiral Brennan's endless enthusiasm for mapping our oceans and coasts was infectious to all who sailed with him.

During his various land assignments, Admiral Brennan provided valuable technical direction to the many physical scientists, hydrographers, cartographers, and officers who worked for him while leading change to pull charting services ever more into the digital age. He served as a reliable resource to various maritime stakeholders and other Federal Agencies, using his effective interpersonal skills to bring NOAA assets to bear in addressing their concerns. He notably earned the NOAA Corps Commendation Medal and the Department of Commerce Group Silver Medal for his service during Hurricane Irene by coordinating NOAA resources to quickly reopen the port of Norfolk, a waterway that is as vital for national security as it is for global commerce. I am proud to point out that along the way, he earned a master's degree in ocean engineering at the University of New Hampshire's esteemed Center for Coastal and Ocean Mapping.

However, Admiral Brennan's stellar career is not what endeared himself to so many or what makes his passing so devastating. He was an exemplary civil servant and leader, and he is remembered as the person whom so many were grateful to work alongside during their own careers. People across the country remember Admiral Brennan for his empathy, wry humor, generosity, friendship, and humanity. Many sought his guidance on personal matters as much as they did on professional challenges, and he went out of his way for them, seeking out the struggling colleague to cheer them up with his warm wit or changing plans to chat over a commiserating meal. The task at hand was important to Admiral Brennan, but he never looked past the people around him, putting them first. My thoughts are with NOAA and the maritime community, knowing that his loss has created a hole in the hearts of all who were fortunate to know him.

More importantly, my deepest sympathies go out to his wife Tracey and his two sons, Ty and Sam, who lost a wonderful husband and loving father far too soon. By all accounts, Admiral Brennan's family were front and center in his life, and they never left his thoughts, especially when he was away in support of NOAA's mission.

On behalf of all the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in honoring Admiral Brennan for his leadership, integrity, and dedicated years of service to this grateful Nation. May he rest in peace.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING WILLIAM ''BILLY'' JORDAN JARRELL

● Mr. DAINES. Madam President, today I have the honor of recognizing the life of a great man, William ''Billy'' Jordan Jarrell. Billy passed away on May 11, 2021, after suffering from juvenile diabetes since he was 12.

Billy was part of a large, loving family. He was a beloved brother, son, cousin, and uncle. Growing up, Billy could often be found on the baseball field, where he excelled and was even inducted into the Major League Baseball Hall of Fame in a section dedicated to Little League. He was also an avid Alabama football fan. Former teammates, classmates, and coworkers all miss him greatly.

I am thankful for the passion that Billy showed for public service and grateful for the time that he dedicated to advocating for a range of issues including energy and Native American issues.

It is my honor to pay tribute to Billy, who was loved by many. I pray that his friends and family find peace in this hard time.●

UTAH 2021 SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTEES

● Mr. LEE. Madam President, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize 13 exemplary men and women who are among the best and brightest that Utah has to offer. These individuals have answered the call to service by applying and receiving appointments to the U.S. Air Force Academy, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, the U.S. Military Academy, and the U.S. Naval Academy.

As a Member of Congress, it is my privilege under title 10 of the United States Code to nominate a number of young men and women to attend these iconic service academies. However, receiving a congressional nomination does not guarantee acceptance. To be admitted, each applicant must meet—on his or her own merits—the academies' rigorous standards.

I am happy to report that all of the appointees being recognized today surpassed the expected standards. Not only have they demonstrated their impressive mental and physical aptitude, they have also shown their high moral character, the capacity for leadership, courage, honesty, prudence, and self-discipline. These appointees maintain a steadfast commitment to service and to standing up for our country. They emulate the foundational character qualities upon which our service academies are built.

I can say, without hesitation or exaggeration that you would be hard-pressed to find a more accomplished, talented, patriotic group of American citizens anywhere. They will be a credit to our Nation as they set off for Colorado Springs, Kings Point, West Point, and Annapolis. I look forward to seeing what they accomplish in the years to come. I am honored to recognize and congratulate these fine Utahns in the U.S. Senate.

Grace Bales, from Heber City, UT has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy. She is a graduate of Shattuck-St. Mary's School in Minnesota where she was captain of the soccer team and earned academic all-State honors. She was a high school student ambassador and member of the student government. She helped lead the cooking club and participated in a number of activities including the knowledge bowl and debate. Grace recently attended the University of Texas Dallas, where she played soccer.

Wyatt Wayne Gleed graduated from Stansbury High School and will soon enter the U.S. Naval Academy. An Eagle Scout, he maintained a 4.0 GPA while taking challenging classes and was a member the National Honor Society. He earned academic all-State honors for cross country while his team became the two-time 4A State champions. Wyatt is a champion archer, an officer in the Technology Student Association, and a member of the Math, Engineering, Science, Achievement, MESA, Team.

Hailey Patricia Holland, from Logan, UT, has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. A graduate of George C. Marshall High School in Virginia, Hailey was a member of the AFJROTC, Model UN, and cross country and track teams. She participated in Utah's Chinese dual immersion classes and was selected for Girls State. Grace served as president of her church youth group and participated in Color Guard honors at community events. This nationally ranked triathlete will follow her father's footsteps into the Army.

Patrick Walker Hoopes accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy. A 2020 graduate of Skyridge High School, Patrick has spent this year at the Air Force Academy Preparatory School. In high school, he earned the title of ''Utah State'' All-Around Gymnastics Champion and qualified for nationals. He enjoys snowboarding, camping, and videography, including his work on The Ridge, his high school video production program.

Eva Fern Huber, after receiving multiple service academy appointments, has chosen to attend the U.S. Naval Academy. She stayed busy at Cyprus High School as a student body officer and captain of the tennis and basketball teams. She was a member of the National Honor Society and assisted her fellow students as a member of the Hope Squad. Eva was selected for Girls State and participated in the FBI Teen Academy and the International Children's Choir.

Zachary Ryan Kofroth accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy. He graduated from Utah Military Academy—Hill Field, where he participated in AFJROTC as a squadron commander, as well as basketball and weightlifting. Zachary is a second team All-American and two-time Junior Olympian in fencing. He also completed over 200 hours of community service and was a member of the National Honor Society. Zachary founded the UMA Diversity Task Force and served as a member of the UMA Student Advocacy Group.

Jack Mezo Meyer, a graduate of The Waterford School, was proud to accept his appointment to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. He is following a family tradition of military service through academies. Jack was a captain of the lacrosse and basketball teams, as well as a student mentor, and cellist in the orchestra. He enjoys building and flying drones and is restating a Mustang. He also provided service at the Salt Lake City VA Fisher House and Canyon Creek Ranch & Equine Rescue.

Gavin Cox Nielsen will be attending the U.S. Air Force Academy after his graduation from West High School. He served as captain of the wrestling team and a pole vaulter for the track & field team. His JROTC team earned the title of State Champions in Orienteering. Gavin participated in many service projects through the Key Club, is a member of the Arabic Honor Society, and has earned his Eagle Scout Award. He enjoys Supermoto and Superbike racing.

David Cheyenne Orr has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy. He is a graduate of Bingham High School, where he participated in lacrosse and was an officer in Health Occupational Students of America, HOSA. David has been especially focused on service. As a Boy Scouts, he achieved the rank of Eagle Scout by donating 324 pairs of shoes to Haiti, as well as a school volunteer in South Korea, completing 400 hours of service helping students during the pandemic.

Henry Ellis Powell will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point after graduating in 2019 from the American International School of Utah and attending the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School. Henry enlisted in the Army National Guard, served as a cannon crewmember, and volunteered for the COVID–19 Task Force. In high school, Henry earned his Eagle Scout Award, was a member of the Student Senate, the first chair trumpet in the symphony orchestra, and the two-time DECA State champion in Business Law and Ethics.

Cade Moroni Smith has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. A graduate of Lone Peak High School, he was selected to attend Boys State and was a member of the National Honor Society. He earned his Eagle Scout Award and served as a leader his church youth group with over 600 young people. A captain of his club soccer team, he also earned Academic All-State honors for cross country.

Cameron Walker Solomon, a Park City High School graduate, accepted his appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy. Cameron is a skilled mogul skier who qualified for nationals. He was a member of the National Honor Society and an AP Scholar with Distinction; a member of the Societe Honoraire de Français and French Club; and a volunteer with the Park City Christian Center and the National Ability Center. Cameron also played soccer and was awarded Academic All-State.

Bradley Rex Thornton accepted an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. A graduate of West High School, Bradley served as a student body officer and was a member of the Health Occupation Students of America, HOSA, and the German Club. He was captain of the basketball team, and an Eagle Scout who is also a leader in his church youth group. In addition to liking water sports, Bradley likes to play the piano.

Mr. President, it has been inspiring to nominate each of these exceptional young men and women. They give me great hope for the future of our armed services and confidence in the future of our Nation.

To these 13 appointees and to all their future classmates from around the country, thank you for your commitment to service. I commend your achievements. This is just the beginning of your journey. As you progress, never forget the foundation of your success thus far.

You would not have arrived at this point without the dedication and example of your parents, family, teachers, coaches, and mentors. Moreover, your own sacrifice and hard work have proven essential. You have accomplished so much.

Strive to continue on the path of strong moral character and to keep love of country as a guiding principle. Look to the past with gratitude and to the future with conviction. If you stay this course, I have no doubt that your future holds great things in store. I look forward to hearing of it. Congratulations. I wish you the very best.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Christine Elizabeth Wormuth, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

Navy nomination of Capt. Kristin Acquavella, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Jay M. Bargeron and ending with Brig. Gen. Matthew G. Trollinger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 3, 2021.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert I. Miller, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Edward D. Banta, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Gen. Paul J. LaCamera, to be General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Randy A. George, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Cody W. Ables and ending with Austin R. Zimmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jared T. Abramowicz and ending with Gabrielle R. Zuniga, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Ruben Adornorodriguez and ending with Adam Brian Zucker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Donald J. Adkins and ending with Zheng Zhong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Kaila Weber Acres and ending with Jaimie M. Wyckoff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

Army nomination of Che T. Arosemena, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Regina N. Moeckel, to be Major.

Army nomination of Brendan J. Cullinan, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of James B. Kavanaugh, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Justin P. Overbaugh, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Kyle R. Abruzzese and ending with D012084, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Jason K. Abbott and ending with D015268, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Isaiah C. Abbott and ending with D015178, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Bryan B. Ault and ending with Timothy D. Zalesky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Aaron T. Murray and ending with Tiffany H. Y. Pikelee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Army nomination of Christopher L. Hansen, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Joseph W. Hockett, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Jared A. Mason, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Daniel W. Laux, to be Colonel.

Navy nomination of James M. McDonald, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Zachary P. Ruthven, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Donald G. Barnett, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Robert W. McFarlin IV, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael G. Mortensen, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Justin A. Dargan, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Raymond Sudduth, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Eric D. Lockett, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Benjamin R. Ventresca, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Roy M. Hoagland II, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Space Force nominations beginning with Christian Nels Alf and ending with Daniel R. Zeri, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Bonnie D. Jenkins, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

Jose W. Fernandez, of New York, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years.

Jose W. Fernandez, of New York, to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Jose W. Fernandez, of New York, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Ali Abdi and ending with Mary Ellen Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2021.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Abdulrazak Mahamudu Abass and ending with Ashley B. Zung, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2021.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jonathan Raphael Cohen and ending with Alaina Teplitz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2021. (minus 1 nominee: Maureen E. Cormack)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Alexander S. Allen and ending with Iva Ziza, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1796. A bill to prohibit procurement, purchasing, and sale by the Department of Defense of certain items containing perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1797. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to expand the funding authority for renovating, constructing, and expanding certain facilities; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1798. A bill to provide for strategies to increase access to telehealth under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 1799. A bill to professionalize the position of Sexual Assault Response Coordinator in the military, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1800. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain types of human-animal chimeras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1801. A bill to amend section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to require an electronic, searchable database of the importation, production, shipment, receipt, sale, or other disposition of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 1802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and modify employer educational assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself and Mr. OSSOFF):

S. 1803. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Columbus, Georgia, as the ''Robert S. Poydasheff Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1804. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health and promote safe motherhood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1805. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for disaster mitigation expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. ERNST, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend tax incentives for biodiesel and renewable diesel; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 1807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a production and investment tax credit related to the production of clean hydrogen; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1808. A bill to establish a pilot program for the transfer and sale of toll credits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1809. A bill to eliminate asset limits employed by certain federally funded means-tested public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. KING, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1810. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1811. A bill to increase the recruitment and retention of school-based mental health services providers by low-income local educational agencies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1812. A bill to modify the boundary of the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1813. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to support research on, and expanded access to, investigational drugs for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 1814. A bill to authorize the Women Who Worked on the Home Front Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 1815. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers to disclose to the Securities and Exchange Commission information regarding workforce management policies, practices, and performance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1816. A bill to amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HAGERTY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1817. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a competitive grant program to repair, improve, rehabilitate, or replace bridges to improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of the movement of people and freight over bridge crossings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1818. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to repay the credit risk premiums paid with respect to certain railroad infrastructure loans after the obligations attached to such loans have been satisfied; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1819. A bill to support State, Tribal, and local efforts to remove access to firearms from individuals who are a danger to themselves or others pursuant to court orders for this purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 1820. A bill to increase the number of landlords participating in the Housing Choice Voucher program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1821. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a consistent standard of health care to incarcerated individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 1822. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish within the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce a China Economic Data Coordination Center; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1823. A bill to require the inclusion of voter registration information with certain leases and vouchers for federally assisted rental housing and mortgage applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1824. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of economic defense response teams; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1825. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to establish consumer product safety standards for firearm locks and firearm safes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1826. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to require a State child health plan to include coverage of screening blood lead tests, to codify such requirement under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1827. A bill to establish an expansive infrastructure program to create local jobs and raise the quality of life in every community, to launch middle class career pathways in infrastructure, and to invest in high-quality American jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KING, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1828. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 to authorize the provision of payment to personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency who incur qualifying injuries to the brain, to authorize the provision of payment to personnel of the Department of State who incur similar injuries, 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. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. Res. 232. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that acts of violence against Jewish people in the United States and around the world and the poisonous rhetoric from politicians and others promoted by the media that has helped inspire such violence is condemnable and has no place in society; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 233. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of a National Bike Month and in appreciation of cyclists and others for promoting bicycle safety and the benefits of cycling; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 234. A resolution recognizing the 100th Anniversary of the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. Res. 235. A resolution designating May 15, 2021, as ''National MPS Awareness Day'' ; considered and agreed to.

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

S. Res. 236. A resolution to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in United States v. Wornick; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. HAGERTY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 237. A resolution approving of the sales of defense items to Israel notified to Congress on May 5, 2021; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 56

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for training and support services for families and caregivers of people living with Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia.

S. 189

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 189, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for annual cost-of-living adjustments to be made automatically by law each year in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 437

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor 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. 464

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were

added as cosponsors of S. 464, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 510

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 510, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on the net value of assets of a taxpayer, and for other purposes.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to improve the effectiveness of tribal child support enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 545, a bill to permanently exempt payments made from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account from sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 586, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat the opioid crisis by promoting access to non-opioid treatments in the hospital outpatient setting.

S. 597

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to eliminate racial, religious, and other discriminatory profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 610

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 610, a bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 611, a bill to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 613

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy and to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary to provide service dogs to veterans with mental illnesses who do not have mobility impairments.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to include a payment and performance security requirement for certain infrastructure financing, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 659, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the ''Hello Girls'' .

S. 773

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 773, a bill to enable certain hospitals that were participating in or applied for the drug discount program under section 340B of the Public Health Service Act prior to the COVID–19 public health emergency to temporarily maintain eligibility for such program, and for other purposes.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 775

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 775, a bill to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing-related misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 786

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 786, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to review laws relating to the illegal passing of school buses and to execute a public safety messaging campaign relating to illegal passing of school buses, and for other purposes.

S. 792

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

S. 998

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 998, a bill to provide grants to States that do not suspend, revoke, or refuse to renew a driver's license of a person or refuse to renew a registration of a motor vehicle for failure to pay a civil or criminal fine or fee, and for other purposes.

S. 1089

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to direct the Government Accountability Office to evaluate appropriate coverage of assistive technologies provided to patients who experience amputation or live with limb difference.

S. 1095

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1095, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the disapproval by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of courses of education offered by public institutions of higher learning that do not charge veterans the in-State tuition rate for purposes of Survivors' and Dependents' Educational Assistance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill 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.

S. 1453

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1453, a bill to reauthorize title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve and encourage innovation in international education, and for other purposes.

S. 1468

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1468, a bill to direct the Secretary of

Veterans Affairs to expand the Rural Access Network for Growth Enhancement Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study to assess certain mental health care resources of the Department of Veterans Affairs available to veterans who live in rural areas.

S. 1491

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1491, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve obstetric care in rural areas.

S. 1520

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1520, a bill to reform the disposition of charges and convening of courts-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and increase the prevention of sexual assaults and other crimes in the military.

S. 1535

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1535, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1593

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1593, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the designation of general surgery shortage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1641

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1641, a bill to prohibit rescinding the recognition of Israel's sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

S. 1642

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) were added as cosponsors of S. 1642, a bill to require the Secretary of State to submit a report on the status of women and girls in Afghanistan, and for other purposes.

S. 1687

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1687, a bill to amend section 21 of the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes.

S. 1691

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1691, a bill to require an annual report on the cybersecurity of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1722

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1722, a bill to amend section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to ensure that efforts to engage in espionage or technology transfer are considered in visa issuance, and for other purposes.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1728, a bill to create dedicated funds to conserve butterflies in North America, plants in the Pacific Islands, freshwater mussels in the United States, and desert fish in the Southwest United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1747

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1747, a bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data, and for other purposes.

S. 1751

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1751, a bill to provide that funding for Gaza shall be made available instead for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

S. 1786

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

S. 1791

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1791, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand existing tax credits to include non-passenger electric-powered vehicles, associated recharging and refueling infrastructure, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 67

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 67, a resolution calling for the immediate release of Trevor Reed, a United States citizen who was unjustly found guilty and sentenced to 9 years in a Russian prison.

S. RES. 119

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 119, a resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Senators of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a training-related injury.

S. RES. 230

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 230, a resolution congratulating the students, parents, teachers, and leaders of charter schools across the United States for making ongoing contributions to education, and supporting the ideals and goals of the 22nd annual National Charter Schools Week, to be held May 9 through May 15, 2021.

AMENDMENT NO. 1503

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1503 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1507

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1507 proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1561

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1561 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1596

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1596 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1626

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1626 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1770

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1770 intended to be proposed 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.

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1770 intended to be proposed to S. 1260, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 1798

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1798 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1813

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1813 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1831

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1831 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1841

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1841 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1877

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1877 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1891

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1891 proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1894

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1894 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1911

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1911 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1925

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1925 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1926

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1926 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1936

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1936 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1940

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1940 intended to be proposed 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1973

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1973 intended to be proposed 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1797. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to expand the funding authority for renovating, constructing, and expanding certain facilities; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the bipartisan ''Urban Indian Health Providers Facilities Improvement Act.''

This legislation honors our Federal trust responsibility by providing parity to Urban Indian Organizations that provide culturally competent health care to Native Americans living in urban areas.

This legislation would remove the unjust and arbitrary restriction that prevents Urban Indian Organizations from using appropriated funds for construction and facilities upgrades.

This restriction is particularly untenable in the midst of the COVID–19 pandemic.

Current law only permits the Indian Health Service to make construction or facilities funds available to Urban Indian Organizations to assist them in meeting or maintaining a now-obsolete accreditation standard.

This limitation prevents Urban Indian Organizations from using appropriated funding for facilities, maintenance and improvement, sanitation, equipment, and other necessary construction upgrades, which limits their ability to provide the quality health care that Native Americans deserve.

Urban Indian Organizations are the only tribal health organization burdened by this restriction. This legislation would provide parity to Urban Indian Organizations and improve the safety and quality of care for urban Indians.

California is home to one of the largest populations of Native Americans, and Los Angeles and San Francisco have two of the largest urban Native American populations in the country. Almost 90% of Native Americans in California live in urban areas and therefore don't access health care through their tribe.

Further, there are no Indian Health Service hospitals in California, so the California Urban Indian Organizations are a lifeline to Native Americans in my state. Removing this unjust burden on Urban Indian Organizations would allow them to improve the quality of the culturally competent care that they provide.

I thank Senator LANKFORD for co-leading this bill with me, and Congressmen GALLEGO and BACON for introducing this legislation in the House of Representatives.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the bipartisan ''Urban Indian Health Providers Facilities Improvement Act'' as quickly as possible.

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

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1804. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health and promote safe motherhood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. president. There are significant racial and ethnic inequities in maternal and infant mortality rates in the U.S. American Indian/Alaska Native women are more than twice as likely as nonHispanic white women to die as a result of pregnancy or its complications, and the infant mortality rate among babies born to American Indian/Alaska Native women is 2.1 times higher than that of non-Hispanic white women. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the maternal mortality rate for non-Hispanic Black women in 2018 is more than 2.5 times higher than the maternal mortality rate of non-Hispanic white women, and the infant mortality rate of non-Hispanic Black women is more than 2.3 times higher than the infant mortality rate of non-Hispanic white women. Any pregnant woman choosing to have a child should be able to do so safely without regard to income, race, ethnicity, employment status, or any other socio-economic factor.

This is why Senator MURKOWSKI and I are reintroducing the Mothers and Newborns Success Act, which aims to reduce maternal and infant mortality, ensure that all infants can grow up healthy and safe, and protect women's health before, during, and after pregnancy. Our legislation supports innovation in maternal health delivery and improves data collection on maternal mortality and maternal deaths, including implementing quality assurance processes to improve the validity of pregnancy checkbox data from death certificates so that we can better understand the causes of maternal deaths. The bill will help ensure that women are matched with birthing facilities that are risk-appropriate for their particular needs to improve maternal and neonatal care and health outcomes. The legislation strengthens support for women during the critical postpartum period, the year after birth.

The bill also establishes a public and provider awareness campaign through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to promote awareness of maternal health warnings signs and the importance of vaccinations for pregnant women and children, ensuring pregnant women get the vaccinations they need. The bill promotes maternal health research, providing technical assistance to states to ensure representation of communities of color in key datasets. The bill establishes a National Maternal Health Research Network at the National Institute of Health to support innovative research to reduce maternal mortality and promote maternal health. The bill supports the Rural Maternity and Obstetric Management Strategies (RMOMS) Program at the Health Resources and Services Administration to improve access to, and continuity of, obstetrics care in rural communities, including thorough use of telehealth.

No woman should fear for her or her child's health because of socio-economic factors, such as race or geographic location. We need to ensure more women of color and their children, particularly Black women and children given the significant disparities they experience, receive equitable care and a fair chance for a healthy pregnancy and safe delivery. COVID–19 and its impact on pregnant women has only underscored the need for urgent action. The Mothers and Newborns Success Act is a significant step toward reducing racial, ethnic, and geographic inequities in maternal and infant health. I'm calling on my Senate colleagues to cosponsor this bill and support its passage so we can enact positive systemic changes to make sure more women and newborns thrive and have the maximum chance for success.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1812. A bill to modify the boundary of the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in the State of Illinois; to the

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1812

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Lincoln Home National Historic Site Boundary Modification Act''.

SEC. 2. LINCOLN HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

Public Law 92–127 (54 U.S.C. 320101 note; 85 Stat. 347) is amended—

(1) in the first section—

(A) by striking ''That, in order to'' and inserting the following:

''SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF LINCOLN HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—The boundary of the Lincoln Home National Historic Site established under subsection (a) is modified as generally depicted on the map entitled 'Proposed Boundary Expansion of the Lincoln Home National Historic Site' and dated February 26, 2021.'';

(2) in section 2—

(A) by striking the section designation and all that follows through ''The'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) ACCESSIBILITY.—To improve accessibility, the Secretary of the Interior shall modify the following areas located within the boundary of the Lincoln Home National Historic Site to provide universal design and accessibility by raising the height of the street to match the height of the sidewalk with no sloped surfaces:

''(1) The intersection at 8th Street and Jackson Street.

''(2) The area in front of the home of Abraham Lincoln.''; and

(3) in section 3, by striking the section designation and all that follows through ''There are'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 232—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT ACTS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES AND AROUND THE WORLD AND THE POISONOUS RHETORIC FROM POLITICIANS AND OTHERS PROMOTED BY THE MEDIA THAT HAS HELPED INSPIRE SUCH VIOLENCE IS CONDEMNABLE AND HAS NO PLACE IN SOCIETY

Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. HAGERTY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 232

Whereas Jews across the United States have been threatened, cursed at, spit on, burned, and physically attacked in at least 193 antisemitic acts of violence during the first week of the 2021 conflict between Israel and Palestinians;

Whereas pro-Palestinian protestors threatened, shoved, and threw fireworks at bystanders in the Diamond District of Midtown Manhattan, an area with many Jewish-owned businesses;

Whereas pro-Palestinian protestors punched, threw objects, and directed antisemitic slurs at a group of Jewish men eating at a restaurant in Los Angeles;

Whereas convoys of trucks bearing Palestinian flags drove through London shouting through loudspeakers: ''F___ the Jews'', ''F___ their mothers'', ''F___ their daughters'', and ''Rape their daughters'';

Whereas an elderly Jewish man was beaten with sticks by a mob at a pro-Palestinian protest in Toronto;

Whereas a Member of Congress called Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu an ''ethno-nationalist'' on the floor of the House of Representatives and in a tweet accused the Israeli military of committing war crimes;

Whereas, after the announcement of a ceasefire in Israel, a Member of Congress tweeted, ''The Israeli military's occupation continues. The blockade continues. The ethnic cleansing continues.'';

Whereas a Member of Congress described Israel in a tweet as an ''apartheid state''; and

Whereas a Member of Congress tweeted that the Israeli military response to Palestinian terrorist attacks was killing ''babies, children and their parents'' and that Palestinians are ''being massacred'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns hatred and violence against Jews;

(2) denounces the poisonous anti-Israel rhetoric of elected officials that has inflamed hatred and inspired escalating violence against Jews;

(3) rejects the biased, incomplete, and inaccurate information promulgated by the news media in the United States about Israel and the Government of Israel's efforts to protect its citizens from terrorism;

(4) celebrates the innumerable contributions of American Jews to our Nation, culture, values, and way of life; and

(5) reaffirms its intent to ensure that Jews in the United States—

(A) are treated with dignity and respect; and

(B) receive the full protection of the law owed to them as citizens of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 233—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE IN SUPPORT OF A NATIONAL BIKE MONTH AND IN APPRECIATION OF CYCLISTS AND OTHERS FOR PROMOTING BICYCLE SAFETY AND THE BENEFITS OF CYCLING

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 233

Whereas there are more than 57,000,000 adult cyclists in the United States;

Whereas recreational cycling is a safe, low-impact, aerobic activity for all ages;

Whereas when an individual cycles as a form of regular exercise, it may benefit the individual's health;

Whereas 870,000 people of the United States choose to commute by bicycle to work;

Whereas many communities in the United States officially recognize May 21st as ''Bike to Work Day'';

Whereas bicycle tourism contributes billions of dollars annually to the United States economy;

Whereas community leaders across the country in partnership with local officials have explored ways to increase access to outdoor bicycle recreation activities;

Whereas outdoor bicycle recreation became even more important during the COVID–19 pandemic;

Whereas a National Bike Month would provide an opportunity to educate United States citizens about the importance of bicycle safety and the health benefits of cycling; and

Whereas the month of May has officially been celebrated as ''National Bike Month'' by the League of American Bicyclists and the majority of the international cycling community since 1956: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) United States citizens should observe a National Bike Month to educate citizens of the United States about the importance of bicycle safety and the health, transportation, and recreational benefits derived from cycling;

(2) health and transportation professionals and organizations should promote bicycle safety and the benefits of cycling; and

(3) United States citizens should applaud the millions of cyclists in the United States and the national and community organizations, individuals, volunteers, and professionals associated with cycling for promoting bicycle safety and the benefits of cycling.

SENATE RESOLUTION 234—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1921 TULSA RACE MASSACRE

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

S. RES. 234

Whereas in the early 1900s many Black individuals and families settled throughout Oklahoma, setting up vibrant communities and dozens of all-Black towns. These individuals came looking for new opportunities, freedom, and a chance for a better life;

Whereas the most famous and prosperous of these Black communities was in Tulsa's Greenwood District;

Whereas O.W. Gurley, a wealthy Black business owner, moved to Tulsa in 1906 and purchased tracts of land sold primarily to Black individuals and families. The land stretched from Pine Street to the north to Archer Street on the south and Detroit Avenue on the west and the Midland Valley rail line on the east;

Whereas segregation and the inaccessibility of resources led O.W. Gurley and others to open a variety of commercial establishments, including rooming houses, grocery stores, barber shops, beauty salons, restaurants, clothiers, pharmacies, movie theaters, dance halls, pool halls, confectioneries, jitney services, and professional offices (such as for doctors, lawyers, dentists, and accountants);

Whereas the Greenwood District became a thriving community where Black business

owners, schools, and churches flourished and, by the late 1910s, it was the wealthiest Black community in the United States;

Whereas churches such as Vernon African Methodist Episcopal Church, Mt. Zion Baptist Church, First Baptist Church North Tulsa, Paradise Baptist Church, Metropolitan Baptist Church, and others became central to the family life and culture of the Greenwood District;

Whereas the Greenwood District became home to prominent professionals such as Dr. A.C. Jackson, who was known as the most skilled Black surgeon in the United States, and prominent attorney B.C. Franklin;

Whereas Ellis Walker Woods, who walked more than 500 miles from Memphis to Oklahoma, answered the call for African-American teachers and became the first principal of Booker T. Washington High School;

Whereas, by 1921, the community was home to thousands of Black residents who lived and worked in the most prosperous Black community in the United States;

Whereas the community earned the name the ''Negro Wall Street of America'' (later, simply known as the ''Black Wall Street'') from the famed African-American author and educator, Booker T. Washington;

Whereas, as the opportunities for Black families grew, the community began to attract more Black families, business owners, well-educated professionals, and individuals fleeing racial oppression and discrimination in other States;

Whereas the town of Tullahassee, Oklahoma, founded in 1883, is regarded as one of the oldest surviving historically Black towns of Indian Territory;

Whereas the area where Tullahassee was founded was originally part of the Creek Nation and the town had an established school by 1850;

Whereas the town of Langston, Oklahoma, was founded in 1890 and named after John Mercer Langston, an African-American educator and Member of the House of Representatives from Virginia;

Whereas, 7 years later, the Oklahoma Territorial Legislature established the Colored Agricultural and Normal University (referred to in this preamble as ''CANU''), which would later be renamed Langston University. The university has grown from 41 students in 1897 to more than 3,000 in 2021;

Whereas prominent Oklahomans such as Melvin Tolson, Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher, Clara Luper, E. Melvin Porter, Frederick Moon, Marques Haynes, Zelia Breaux, Isaac W. Young, Inman Page, and Zella Black Patterson resided in Langston or called CANU home;

Whereas the town of Tatums, Oklahoma, founded in 1895, was named after brothers Lee B. Tatum and Eldridge ''Doc'' Tatum and found prosperity in 1929 when oil wells were drilled;

Whereas Norman Studios filmed Black Gold, a silent film, in Tatums and enlisted the citizens of the town and Marshal L. B. Tatums to be featured in the movie;

Whereas the town of Taft, Oklahoma, founded in 1902 on land allotted to Creek Freedman, changed its name from Twine to Taft to honor the then Secretary of War, later President, William Howard Taft. The town had a thriving business sector with 3 general stores, a drugstore, a brickyard, a soda pop factory, 2 hotels, and a bank;

Whereas the town of Grayson, Oklahoma, brimmed with 5 general stores, 2 blacksmiths, 2 drug stores, a cotton gin, and a physician soon after it was founded in 1902. Originally known as Wildcat, the town changed its name in 1909 to honor the Creek Chief George W. Grayson;

Whereas the town of Boley, Oklahoma, established in 1903 and named after J.B. Boley, a railroad official of the Fort Smith and Western Railway, grew to be one of the wealthiest and largest Black towns in Oklahoma;

Whereas, only 5 years after being founded, Booker T. Washington visited Boley and wrote about the prosperity he had witnessed;

Whereas, in 2021, Boley still carries on their standing tradition of a Black community-based rodeo, now the oldest of its kind in the Nation;

Whereas the town of Rentiesville, Oklahoma, founded in 1903, was developed on 40 acres owned by William Rentie and Phoebe McIntosh;

Whereas John Hope Franklin, a prominent scholar of African-American history, was born in Rentiesville in 1915;

Whereas Franklin and his family later moved to Tulsa where Franklin graduated from Booker T. Washington High School, survived the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre, and went on to become one of Oklahoma's most decorated historians;

Whereas the town of Clearview, Oklahoma, founded in 1903 along the tracks of the Fort Smith and Western Railroad, was widely known for their baseball team;

Whereas, in the summer, people from surrounding counties would come to watch the baseball team play, turning the railroad tracks into substitute bleachers;

Whereas the town of Brooksville, Oklahoma, founded in 1903, was originally named Sewell. The town was renamed in 1912 to honor the first Black man in the area, A. R. Brooks;

Whereas, soon after the town of Brooksville was established, Rev. Jedson White founded the St. John's Baptist Church;

Whereas George W. McLaurin, who was the first Black graduate at the University of Oklahoma, taught at the local school in Brooksville;

Whereas the town of Red Bird, Oklahoma, founded in 1907 along the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railway, was built on land allotted to the Creek Nation;

Whereas E. L. Barber was one of the original developers of the town of Red Bird, the first justice of peace of the town, and an early mayor;

Whereas, before Red Bird officially became a town, Barber had organized the First Baptist Church in 1889, which grew to be the largest church in Red Bird;

Whereas the town of Summit, Oklahoma, founded in 1910 along the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railway, grew because of the town's railway depot;

Whereas Rev. L. W. Thomas organized the St. Thomas Baptist Church in the town of Summit and the congregation met without a building for 6 years until the congregation came together to build the church, which still stands in 2021;

Whereas the town of Vernon, Oklahoma, founded in 1911 on Tankard Ranch in the Creek Nation, was home to many trailblazers such as Ella Woods, who was the first postmaster, and Louise Wesley, who established the first school and church in the town;

Whereas, before the community of Vernon built the New Hope Baptist Church in 1917, the congregation conducted services underneath a tree. New Hope Baptist Church still stands in 2021 after more than 100 years;

Whereas the town of Lima, Oklahoma, founded in 1913 along the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad, came together as a community to improve their town. Together, they built the Mount Zion Methodist Church in 1915, which still stands in 2021;

Whereas, the history of these historically Black towns is interwoven into the history of the State of Oklahoma and the residents of these towns have achieved great successes and faced tremendous challenges;

Whereas the stories of the Black towns and communities in Oklahoma are inextricably linked to the events of May 30 to June 1, 1921, in the Greenwood District of North Tulsa, Oklahoma;

Whereas, on May 30, 1921, a young Black man named Dick Rowland was in downtown Tulsa, Oklahoma, and entered the Drexel Building to use the only bathroom in the area available to Black people;

Whereas an incident occurred on the elevator between Dick Rowland and Sarah Paige, the elevator operator, and Sarah Paige screamed;

Whereas, after a police investigation, the next day Dick Rowland was detained at the Tulsa Police Department for questioning before being moved to the Tulsa Courthouse for additional security;

Whereas, on May 31, 1921, the Tulsa Tribune released a sensationalist story claiming that a young Black male had attacked a White girl;

Whereas that story and long-simmering tensions in the city led to a large group of White individuals surrounding the courthouse to demand that Dick Rowland be released so that he could be lynched;

Whereas a group of Black men traveled to the courthouse to help defend Dick Rowland from the angry mob;

Whereas, after a scuffle at the downtown Tulsa courthouse, White rioters pursued Black men to the Greenwood District and the violence escalated;

Whereas houses and businesses were looted and burned throughout the Greenwood District and attacks lasted well into the next day before being quelled by the Oklahoma City National Guard;

Whereas, in less than 24 hours, 35 city blocks were destroyed by fires and 6,000 African-American individuals were detained;

Whereas, out of the 23 churches that were located in the Greenwood area prior to the 1921 Massacre, only 13 churches survived and only 3 churches were able to be rebuilt after being destroyed: Paradise Baptist Church, Mount Zion Baptist Church, and Vernon AME Church;

Whereas, outside of the massacre area, 5 churches were able to rebuild after being destroyed;

Whereas, the Black citizens in Tulsa began rebuilding the Greenwood District immediately, with Church services resuming the following Sunday;

Whereas this new Black Wall Street reached an economic peak in the mid-1940s but subsequently declined for many reasons that undermined the economic foundation of the community;

Whereas, almost 100 years later, the residents and businesses in the Greenwood District carry on the legacy of resilience and determination;

Whereas Greenwood is home to thousands of individuals and families who make important contributions to their city and the United States and there are countless minority-owned businesses in Greenwood that drive the local economy;

Whereas there is still much work to do to heal the community and ensure all people in Greenwood have the promise of a brighter tomorrow; and

Whereas Greenwood is a community still scarred by the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre, but not defined by it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges that the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre was the worst race massacre in the history of the United States;

(2) recognizes that because of the worst race massacre in the history of the United States, several hundred Black residents of

the Greenwood District were killed and thousands were made homeless overnight, and the most prosperous Black community in the United States was decimated;

(3) urges that the history of what happened in Tulsa during the course of those 2 days in 1921 be taught in the schools of the United States in a factual and accurate manner;

(4) recognizes the important work of groups such as the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre Centennial Commission, the John Hope Franklin Center for Reconciliation, and others who work tirelessly to ensure the story of the Greenwood District is accurately told and remembered;

(5) believes that while significant progress has been made in the 100 years since the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre, there is still work to be done towards racial reconciliation, which can only be accomplished through open, respectful, and frank dialogue;

(6) encourages families of all races to invite families of different races to their homes to have discussions on race, with parents setting examples for their children on how to engage in a conversation that will build better understanding of, and respect for, people of different races;

(7) believes that the significance of the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre and the complete history of the Greenwood District warrant the placement of the area on the National Registry of Historical Places and urges the Department of Interior to work with the community to accomplish this as soon as possible;

(8) hopes that the 100th anniversary weekend is a moment for the country to look to Tulsa to see how racial relations have changed during the last 100 years, to celebrate improvements, and to reflect upon the areas where more work is needed;

(9) urges all people of the United States to continue seeking greater understanding, dialogue, and closer connections to people of different races; and

(10) recognizes the need to help the remaining 13 Black towns in Oklahoma to preserve their historic legacy of political freedom and ensure their stories are known to future generations of Oklahomans and people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 235—DESIGNATING MAY 15, 2021, AS ''NATIONAL MPS AWARENESS DAY''

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

Whereas mucopolysaccharidosis (referred to in this preamble as ''MPS'') are a group of genetically determined lysosomal storage diseases that render the human body incapable of producing certain enzymes needed to break down complex carbohydrates;

Whereas MPS diseases cause complex carbohydrates to be stored in almost every cell in the body, which progressively leads to cellular damage;

Whereas the cellular damage caused by MPS—

(1) adversely affects the human body by damaging the heart, lungs, bones, central nervous system, and other internal organs; and

(2) often results in intellectual disabilities, short stature, corneal damage, joint stiffness, loss of mobility, speech and hearing impairment, heart disease, hyperactivity, chronic respiratory problems, and, most painfully, a drastically shortened life span;

Whereas symptoms of MPS are usually not apparent at birth;

Whereas, without treatment, the life expectancy of an individual afflicted with MPS begins to decrease at a very early stage in the life of that individual;

Whereas research has resulted in the development of limited treatments for some MPS diseases;

Whereas, as of the date of adoption of this resolution, promising advancements in the pursuit of treatments for additional MPS diseases are underway;

Whereas, despite the creation of new remedies, the blood-brain barrier continues to be a significant impediment to effectively treating the brain, which prevents the treatment of many of the symptoms of MPS;

Whereas the quality of life of individuals afflicted with MPS and the treatments available to those individuals will be enhanced through the development of early detection and early intervention techniques;

Whereas treatments for and research advancements relating to MPS are limited by a lack of awareness about MPS diseases;

Whereas the lack of awareness about MPS diseases extends to individuals within the medical community;

Whereas the cellular damage caused by MPS makes MPS a model for the study of many other degenerative genetic diseases; and

Whereas the development of effective therapies and a potential cure for MPS diseases can be accomplished by increased awareness, research, data collection, and information distribution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 15, 2021, as ''National MPS Awareness Day''; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National MPS Awareness Day.

SENATE RESOLUTION 236—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. WORNICK

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

S. RES. 236

Whereas, in the case of *United States v. Wornick*, Cr. No. 20–106, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, the prosecution has requested the production of testimony and, if necessary, documents from Bailey McCue, an employee of the office of former Senator Cory Gardner;

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

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

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

Resolved, That Bailey McCue, an employee of the office of former Senator Cory Gardner, and any other employee of the former Senator's office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary, are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of *United States v. Wornick*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 237—APPROVING OF THE SALES OF DEFENSE ITEMS TO ISRAEL NOTIFIED TO CONGRESS ON MAY 5, 2021

Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. HAGERTY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 237

Whereas, in the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), Congress reaffirmed that it is the policy of the United States to facilitate the common defense of the United States and friendly countries by entering into international arrangements with those countries through authorized sales of defense items;

Whereas, in the Arms Export Control Act, Congress established that it is ''the sense of the Congress that all such sales be approved only when they are consistent with the foreign policy interests of the United States'';

Whereas section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) requires that the President transmit to the leaders and relevant committees of Congress certifications for proposed licenses for the export of certain defense items to Israel in the amount of $100,000,000 or more;

Whereas, on May 5, 2021, the Department of State transmitted to Congress certifications pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act for exports to Israel of defense items valued in excess of $800,000,000, including munitions and defensive systems; and

Whereas, on January 19, 2021, in testimony to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, now-Secretary of State Blinken emphasized that the incoming Presidential administration's ''commitment to Israel's security is sacrosanct and this is something that [now-President Biden] feels very strongly'' and that ''the foundation of our relationship is support for Israel's security'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) finds that the sales of defense items to Israel notified to Congress by the Department of State on May 5, 2021, are consistent with the foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(2) approves of those sales.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1974. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1975. Mr. WYDEN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra.

SA 1976. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1977. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1978. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1979. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1980. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1981. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1982. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1983. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1984. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1985. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1986. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1987. Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1988. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1989. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1990. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. ROSEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1991. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1992. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1993. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1994. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1995. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1996. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1997. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1998. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1999. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2000. Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2001. Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Ms. ERNST) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2002. Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2003. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. TILLIS) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra.

SA 2004. Mr. SASSE (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2005. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. LUJAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2006. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2007. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2008. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2009. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2010. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2011. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2012. Mr. OSSOFF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2013. Mr. OSSOFF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2014. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2015. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2016. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2017. Ms. ERNST (for herself and Ms. HASSAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2018. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2019. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2020. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2021. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2022. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2023. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2024. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2025. Mr. ROMNEY (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2026. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2027. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2028. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2029. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2030. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2031. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1703 submitted by Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. SULLIVAN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2032. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2033. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1974. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division C, add the following:

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 3601. APPEAL OF ASSIGNMENT RESTRICTIONS OR PRECLUSION.

Section 414(a) of the Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017 (22 U.S.C. 2734c(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such right and process shall ensure that any employee subjected to an assignment restriction or preclusion shall have the same appeal rights as provided by the Department regarding denial or revocation of a security clearance. Any such appeal shall be resolved not later than 60 days after such appeal is filed.''.

SA 1975. Mr. WYDEN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. TRADE POLICY AND CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF COVID–19 RESPONSE.

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

(1) it is imperative to promote the development and deployment of vaccines, including to address pandemics like the pandemic relating to COVID–19 and its variants;

(2) as a developed nation with a long-standing commitment to promoting global health, innovation, access to medicine, public welfare, and security, the United States will continue to use the resources and tools at its disposal to promote the distribution of life-saving COVID–19 vaccines to other countries;

(3) President Biden should continue to work with foreign governments, multilateral institutions, nongovernmental organizations, manufacturers, and other stakeholders to quickly identify and address, through targeted and meaningful action, obstacles to ending the COVID–19 pandemic, whether those obstacles are legal, regulatory, contractual, or otherwise;

(4) in any efforts to address trade-related obstacles to ending the COVID–19 pandemic, President Biden should consider how any action would complement the whole-of-government approach of the President to ending the COVID–19 pandemic worldwide, including how any action would impact competitiveness, innovation, and the national security of the United States in the short- and long-term;

(5) the President should strive to create the most appropriate balance between access to COVID–19 vaccines and therapeutics and generating an innovative environment in the United States;

(6) the President should take into account the efforts of malign nations or entities to obtain intellectual property of United States persons through forced technology transfer, theft, or espionage, and accordingly make all efforts to protect that intellectual property from such nations or entities; and

(7) in any efforts to address trade-related obstacles to ending the COVID–19 pandemic, Congress expects timely and meaningful consultations on any negotiations and any agreements or decisions reached regarding matters of concern to members of Congress and their constituents, including issues of competitiveness, innovation, and national security.

(b) TRADE POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO THE COVID–19 PANDEMIC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States to facilitate an effective and efficient response to the global pandemic with respect to COVID–19 by expediting access to life-saving vaccines, medicines, diagnostics, medical equipment, and personal protective equipment.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The United States Trade Representative shall pursue a timely, effective, and efficient response to the trade aspects of the COVID–19 pandemic, including by endeavoring to—

(A) expedite access to medicines and life-saving products through trade facilitation measures;

(B) obtain a reduction or elimination of nontariff barriers and distortions that impact the procurement of life-saving products;

(C) take action to increase access to COVID–19 vaccines globally, while avoiding providing access to intellectual property to nations or entities that seek to utilize the technology for other uses or that may otherwise pose a threat to national security;

(D) eliminate practices that adversely affect trade in perishable or temperature-sensitive products, and facilitate the transfer of materials and products in a manner that preserves their integrity;

(E) further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines by demonstrating sufficient flexibility to respond to a global crisis while retaining a balanced approach to the rights of innovators;

(F) encourage greater cooperation between the World Trade Organization and other international organizations and public-private partnerships, including the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund (commonly referred to as ''UNICEF''), the World Bank, and Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance; and

(G) take into account other legitimate domestic policies of the United States, including health and safety, national security, consumer interests, intellectual property rights, and the laws and regulations related thereto.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—

(1) INTENT TO NEGOTIATE.—If the United States Trade Representative enters any negotiation pursuant to the trade policies described in subsection (b), the Trade Representative shall—

(A) submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register a statement specifying the objectives of the United States in pursuing the negotiation; and

(B) submit to Congress an assessment of how and to what extent entering the negotiation will achieve the trade policies described in subsection (b).

(2) CONSULTATION AND BRIEFING BEFORE MAKING PROPOSALS.—Before making any textual proposal pursuant to the trade policies described in subsection (b), the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) consistent with section 242 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1872), consult with the heads of relevant Federal agencies, including the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Defense, which shall include, as appropriate, discussion of—

(i) the most effective means of addressing the COVID–19 pandemic and any variants to the COVID–19 virus, including by increasing the distribution of COVID–19 vaccines;

(ii) any sensitive technology or intellectual property rights related to the proposal;

(iii) any nations or entities of concern that may benefit from the proposal; and

(iv) other issues that may influence negotiations with respect to the proposal; and

(B) brief members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on the proposal, including with respect to how the objectives sought by the Trade Representative fit into a larger strategy of ending the COVID–19 pandemic.

(3) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—In the course of any negotiations pursuant to the trade policies described in subsection (b), the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(B) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, including by providing any relevant text proposals before discussing those proposals with negotiation participants;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4203(c)) and each committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and each joint committee of Congress, with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by the negotiations; and

(D) follow the guidelines on enhanced coordination with Congress established pursuant to section 104(a)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4203(a)(3)) regarding consultations with Congress, access

to text, and public engagement for the negotiations to the same extent as those guidelines apply to negotiations covered under that section.

(4) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE CONCLUDING NEGOTIATIONS.—

(A) CONSULTATION.—Before either reaching a final agreement or exercising authority provided under section 122(b)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3532(b)(3)) pursuant to the trade policies described in subsection (b), the United States Trade Representative shall consult with—

(i) the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives;

(ii) each committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and each joint committee of Congress, with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by the agreement or exercise of authority; and

(iii) the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4203(c)).

(B) SCOPE.—In conducting consultation under subparagraph (A), the Trade Representative shall—

(i) provide the text of any proposed agreement for final consideration; and

(ii) consult with respect to—

(I) the nature of the agreement; and

(II) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the trade policies described in subsection (b).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''World Trade Organization'', ''WTO'', and ''WTO member'' have the meanings given those terms in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

SA 1976. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 712, strike lines 12 through 17 and insert the following:

(4) the United States Government and other governments around the world must actively oppose racism and intolerance, and use all available and appropriate tools to combat the spread of anti-Asian racism and discrimination;

(5) the United States Government should not restrict the career opportunities of its employees on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, or age; and

(6) the Department of State should expand the appeals process it makes available to employees related to assignment restrictions and preclusions.

SA 1977. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 3219L. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DEFENDING AUSTRALIA FROM ECONOMIC COERCION.

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

(1) the alliance between the United States and Australia provides strategic, economic, and cultural value to both nations;

(2) the security and prosperity of each is vital to the future security and prosperity of both nations;

(3) the close, longstanding cooperation between the United States and Australia in strategic and military affairs is built on strong bonds of trust between the two nations that bolster security and stability in the Indo-Pacific;

(4) Australia is currently the target of a concerted campaign of economic coercion by the People's Republic of China aimed at punishing the government and people of one of the United States' closest allies for the exercise of their sovereign, democratic rights;

(5) the People's Republic of China has employed similar forms of economic coercion against other countries on many other occasions, not only within the Indo-Pacific but around the world;

(6) such a campaign, if successful, has the potential to undermine the sovereignty of Australia and the ability of the Government of Australia to act in concert with the United States toward the shared goal of a free and open Indo-Pacific; and

(7) the routine use of economic coercion by the People's Republic of China against Australia and other countries undermines those countries' ability to speak or act in defense of their own sovereignty, democratic values, and human rights, and is therefore a threat to a free and open global order.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to stand with Australia in its moment of need, providing relevant support to the Government and people of Australia to mitigate the costs of economic coercion by the People's Republic of China to the greatest extent possible;

(2) to work with the Government of Australia and other allies and partners to coordinate collective, cooperative responses to both threatened and actual instances of economic coercion by the People's Republic of China; and

(3) to devise a strategy to guide the implementation of such responses, and to put in place the appropriate personnel, mechanisms, and collective structures to facility their effectiveness.

SA 1978. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1071, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 1075, line 3, and insert the following:

(8) Coordinating with relevant third countries to identify other avenues to assist the partner country, minimize beggar-thy-neighbor trade disruptions, and build shared awareness of and resilience to economic coercion.

(b) INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT.—The pilot program required by subsection (a) should include the following elements:

(1) Identification and designation of relevant personnel within the United States Government with expertise relevant to the objectives specified in subsection (a), including personnel in—

(A) the Department of State, for overseeing the economic defense response team's activities, engaging with the partner country government and other stakeholders, and other purposes relevant to advancing the success of the mission of the economic defense response team;

(B) the United States Agency for International Development, for the purposes of providing technical, humanitarian, and other assistance, generally;

(C) the Department of the Treasury, for the purposes of providing advisory support and assistance on all financial matters and fiscal implications of the crisis at hand;

(D) the Department of Commerce, for the purposes of providing economic analysis and assistance in market development relevant to the partner country's response to the crisis at hand, technology security as appropriate, and other matters that may be relevant;

(E) the Department of Energy, for the purposes of providing advisory services and technical assistance with respect to energy needs as affected by the crisis at hand;

(F) the Department of Homeland Security, for the purposes of providing assistance with respect to digital and cybersecurity matters, and assisting in the development of any contingency plans referred to in paragraphs (3) and (6) of subsection (a) as appropriate;

(G) the Department of Agriculture, for providing advisory and other assistance with respect to responding to coercive measures such as arbitrary market closures that affect the partner country's agricultural sector;

(H) the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to providing support and guidance on trade and investment matters; and

(I) other Federal departments and agencies as determined by the President.

(2) Negotiation of memoranda of understanding, where appropriate, with other United States Government components for the provision of any relevant participating or detailed non-Department of State personnel identified under paragraph (1).

(3) Negotiation of contracts, as appropriate, with private sector representatives or other individuals with relevant expertise to advance the objectives specified in subsection (a).

(4) Development within the United States Government of—

(A) appropriate training curricula for relevant experts identified under paragraph (1) and for United States diplomatic personnel in a country actually or potentially threatened by coercive economic measures;

(B) operational procedures and appropriate protocols for the rapid assembly of such experts into one or more teams for deployment to a country actually or potentially threatened by coercive economic measures; and

(C) procedures for ensuring appropriate support for such teams when serving in a country actually or potentially threatened by coercive economic measures, including, as

applicable, logistical assistance, office space, information support, and communications.

(5) Negotiation with relevant potential host countries of procedures and methods for ensuring the rapid and effective deployment of such teams, and the establishment of appropriate liaison relationships with local public and private sector officials and entities.

(c) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(1) REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT.—Upon establishment of the pilot program required by subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall provide the appropriate committees of Congress with a detailed report and briefing describing the pilot program, the major elements of the program, the personnel and institutions involved, and the degree to which the program incorporates the elements described in subsection (a).

(2) FOLLOW-UP REPORT AND STRATEGY.—Not later than one year after the report required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall provide the appropriate committees of Congress with—

(A) a detailed report and briefing describing the operations over the previous year of the pilot program established pursuant to subsection (a), as well as the Secretary's assessment of its performance and suitability for becoming a permanent program; and

(B) a strategy for building shared resilience to economic coercion among partners that includes steps that could be taken in addition to or instead of such pilot program.

SA 1979. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division C, add the following:

SEC. 3314. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE XXIV OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES AND THE XIII PARALYMPIC WINTER GAMES.

It is the sense of Congress that the International Olympic Committee should relocate the XXIV Olympic Winter Games and XIII Paralympic Winter Games due to the crimes against humanity and other serious violations of human rights committed by the People's Republic of China in mainland China, the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, Hong Kong, the Tibet Autonomous Region and other Tibetan areas, the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, and elsewhere.

SA 1980. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 68, beginning on line 2, strike ''(or'' and all that follows through line 8 and insert ''(or an institution of higher education with an established STEM capacity building program focused on Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives);''.

On page 72, beginning on line 20, strike ''(or'' and all that follows through line 24 and insert ''(or an institution of higher education with an established STEM capacity building program focused on Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives);''.

On page 88, strike lines 4 through 12 and insert the following:

(i) a historically Black college or university which is a part B institution (as defined in section 322 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061));

(ii) a Hispanic-serving institution (as defined in section 502 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a));

(iii) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c));

(iv) an Alaska Native-serving institution or a Native Hawaiian-serving institution (as defined in section 317(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)));

(v) a Predominantly Black Institution (as defined in section 371(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067q(c)));

(vi) an Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institution (as defined in Section 371(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965);

(vii) a Native American-serving nontribal institution (as defined in Section 371(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965); or

(viii) an institution of higher education with an established STEM capacity building program focused on Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives; and

On page 110, beginning on line 9, strike ''institutions of higher education'' and all that follows through ''Indians'' on line 13 and insert ''institutions of higher education with an established STEM capacity building program focused on Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives,''.

Beginning on page 111, on line 25, strike ''(or'' and all that follows through line 4 on page 112 and insert ''(or institutions of higher education with an established STEM capacity building program focused on Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives);''.

On page 137, beginning on line 1, strike ''or an institution'' and all that follows through line 5 and insert ''or an institution of higher education with an established STEM capacity building program focused on Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives).''.

On page 184, beginning on line 6, strike ''(or'' and all that follows through ''Indians)'' on line 10 and insert ''(or an institution of higher education with an established STEM capacity building program focused on Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives)''.

On page 207, beginning on line 14, strike ''(and'' and all the follows through ''Indians)'' on line 18 and insert ''(and institutions of higher education with an established STEM capacity building program focused on Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives)''.

Beginning on page 207, on line 22, strike ''(and'' and all that follows through line 2 on page 208 and insert ''(and institutions of higher education with an established STEM capacity building program focused on Native Hawaiians and Alaska Natives).''.

SA 1981. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 6122 and insert the following:

SEC. 6122. LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT GRANT FUNDING FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION WITH CONFUCIUS INSTITUTES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Confucius Institute'' means a cultural institute established as a partnership between a United States institution of higher education and a Chinese institution of higher education to promote and teach Chinese language and culture that is funded, directly or indirectly, by the Government of the People's Republic of China; and

(2) the term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

(b) RESTRICTIONS OF CONFUCIUS INSTITUTES.—Except as provided in subsection (d), an institution of higher education that maintains a contract or agreement between the institution and a Confucius Institute shall not be eligible to receive Federal funds provided under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), except for funds provided under title IV of such Act, unless the Secretary of Education, after consultation with the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, determines a waiver of this subsection is appropriate, in accordance with subsection (c).

(c) CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE CONTRACTS OR AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of Education, after consultation with the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, may issue a waiver of subsection (b) for an institution of higher education that maintains a contract or agreement between such institution of higher education and a Confucius Institute, and publishes such waiver on the website of the Department of Education, if—

(1) the contract or agreement includes clear provisions that—

(A) protect academic freedom at the institution;

(B) prohibit the application of any foreign law on any campus of the institution; and

(C) grant full managerial authority of the Confucius Institute to the institution, including full control over what is being taught, the activities carried out, the research grants that are made, and who is employed at the Confucius Institute; and

(2) the institution makes available for public inspection—

(A) a true copy of the contract or agreement between the institution and the Confucius Institute; and

(B) a translation in English of the contract or agreement between the institution and the Confucius Institute that is certified by a third party translator.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, this section shall not apply to an institution of higher education that maintains a contract or agreement between the institution and a Confucius Institute, if the institution—

(1) has made available for public inspection—

(A) a true copy of the contract or agreement between the institution and the Confucius Institute; and

(B) a translation in English of the contract or agreement between the institution and the Confucius Institute that is certified by a third party translator; and

(2) has fulfilled the requirements for a waiver from—

(A) the Department of Defense as described under section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283); or

(B) the Director of the National Science Foundation in accordance with section 2525.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to be effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1982. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 3209(c)(2), strike ''and the Secretary of the Treasury'' and insert '', the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Secretary of Energy''.

SA 1983. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division F, add the following:

TITLE IV—AGGREGATED DEMAND MAPPING AND SUPPLY CHAINS

SEC. 6401. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(2) INPUT.—The term ''input''—

(A) means a natural resource, raw material, or human resource used to construct a finished product or other good; and

(B) may be comprised of one or more components.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

(4) TARGET INDUSTRY.—The term ''target industry'' means an industry identified under section 6403(a).

(5) UNITED STATES BUSINESS.—The term ''United States business'' means a business that has a primary headquarters located in a State or territory of the United States.

SEC. 6402. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to reduce reliance on foreign manufacturing, boost United States job opportunities, and support domestic manufacturing;

(2) to provide transparency and assistance to manufacturers in order to divert supply chains from foreign countries and back to the United States; and

(3) to facilitate understanding of the implications of economic, public health, and national security vulnerabilities in the United States supply chain.

SEC. 6403. PILOT PROGRAM ON ONLINE TOOLKIT AND DATABASE ON AGGREGATED DEMAND MAPPING AND SUPPLY CHAINS FOR UNITED STATES BUSINESSES.

(a) DETERMINATION OF TARGET INDUSTRIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify 3 industries in the United States in which supply chain vulnerabilities exist related to the national security, economic security, or public health of the United States.

(2) CONSULTATIONS.—The Secretary may consult with the heads of other agencies in identifying the 3 target industries under paragraph (1).

(b) PILOT PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ONLINE TOOLKIT AND DATABASE.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall carry out a pilot program to develop—

(1) an online toolkit described in subsection (c); and

(2) a private and confidential database described in subsection (d).

(c) ONLINE TOOLKIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The online toolkit described in this subsection is a mechanism under which—

(A) United States businesses directly related to a target industry voluntarily submit to the Secretary information, subject to subsection (e), on the products produced by such businesses and the inputs required for such products, which may include, with respect to such an input—

(i) the specific geographic location of the production of the input, including if the input is sourced from the United States or a foreign country;

(ii) the business name of a supplier of the input;

(iii) information related to perceived or realized challenges in securing the input;

(iv) information related to the suspected vulnerabilities or implications of a disruption in securing the input, whether related to national security or the effect on the United States business; or

(v) in the case of an input sourced from a foreign country, information on—

(I) why the input is sourced from a foreign country rather than in the United States; and

(II) if the United States business would be interested in identifying an alternative produced in the United States;

(B) United States businesses may opt in to requesting and receiving contact information or general information about a United States source or a foreign source for an input; and

(C) the Secretary makes information provided under this subsection available, subject to the requirements of subsection (e), to enable other United States businesses to identify inputs for their products produced in the United States.

(2) RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO ONLINE TOOLKIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary—

(i) shall ensure that the online toolkit described in paragraph (1) is accessible only by United States businesses registered with the Department of Commerce under subparagraph (B); and

(ii) may determine the scope of the access of a United States business described in subparagraph (A) to the online toolkit.

(B) REGISTRATION OF UNITED STATES BUSINESSES.—The Secretary shall establish a process for registering each United States business that seeks access to the online toolkit. In registering a United States business under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall verify the identity of the business and that the business is not a foreign entity.

(3) FORMAT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the online toolkit described in paragraph (1) is—

(A) searchable and filterable according to the type of information; and

(B) presented in a user-friendly format.

(d) DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The database described in this subsection is a database—

(A) containing information—

(i) described in subsection (c) voluntarily submitted by United States businesses directly related to a target industry; and

(ii)(I) with respect to which such businesses have specified under subsection (e)(1)(A)(ii) that the information is private and authorized to be shared only with the Department of Commerce for purposes of the analysis of supply chain vulnerabilities under section 6405; or

(II) treated as private and confidential under subsection (e)(1)(B); and

(B) available only to senior officials of the Department of Commerce for purposes of conducting that analysis.

(2) PROHIBITION ON ACCESS.—The Secretary shall prohibit any private entity from requesting or receiving information included in the database described in paragraph (1).

(3) SECURITY.—The Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to ensure the security and integrity of all information stored within the database described in paragraph (1) and to safeguard the database against cyberattacks.

(e) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—

(1) RESTRICTION OF SHARING OF INFORMATION BY UNITED STATES BUSINESSES.—The Secretary shall ensure that, in submitting information to the Secretary under this section—

(A) a United States business is able to specify—

(i) what information may be shared with other United States businesses, including what information may be searchable by other businesses seeking to obtain information on inputs for their products produced in the United States;

(ii) what information should be private and shared only with the Department of Commerce for purposes of the analysis of supply chain vulnerabilities under section 6405; and

(iii) what information is business confidential or otherwise proprietary in nature and may be restricted in its dissemination to Congress in accordance with paragraph (2); and

(B) if a United States business does not specify under subparagraph (A) how the information may be shared, that information is treated as private and confidential.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Information submitted to the Secretary in relation to the online toolkit and database established under this section—

(A) may not be considered public records and shall be exempt from any Federal law relating to public disclosure requirements; and

(B) may not be subject to discovery or admission as public information or evidence in judicial or administrative proceedings without the consent of the United States business that submitted the information.

(f) VERIFICATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall establish a process for verifying the accuracy of information submitted to the Secretary under this section.

(g) REPORTING.—

(1) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary

shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(i) an assessment of the pilot program carried out under this section, including statistics regarding the number of new entries, total businesses involvement, and any change in participation rate in the online toolkit and database during the preceding 180-day period;

(ii) recommendations for additional actions to improve the online toolkit and database and participation in the online toolkit and database; and

(iii) such other information as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(B) FORM.—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(2) PUBLIC REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall post on a publicly available website of the Department of Commerce a report that, except as provided by subparagraph (B), includes—

(i) general statistics related to foreign and domestic sourcing of inputs used by United States businesses;

(ii) an estimate of the percentage of total inputs used by United States businesses obtained from foreign countries;

(iii) data on such inputs disaggregated by industry, geographical location, and size of operation; and

(iv) a description of the methodology used to calculate the statistics and estimates described in this subparagraph.

(B) INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION.—If the Secretary determines that insufficient information was submitted by United States businesses under this section to generate the statistics and estimates described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary may (subject to subsection (e)) determine what information is appropriate to make available to the public under this paragraph.

(C) CONSULTATIONS.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence in drafting the report required by subparagraph (A) to ensure that no sensitive information will be included in the report.

(h) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—The Secretary shall carry out this section in accordance with the following provisions of law:

(1) Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act'').

(2) Section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Privacy Act of 1974'').

(3) Section 1905 of title 18, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Trade Secrets Act'').

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) INITIAL FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $12,000,000 for fiscal year 2022—

(A) for the establishment of the online toolkit and database under this section; and

(B) for the salaries and expenses of additional staff to carry out this section.

(2) ONGOING FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 and 2024 to carry out this section.

(3) RETURN OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall return to the Treasury any funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations under this subsection that have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated.

SEC. 6404. NATIONAL PUBLIC OUTREACH CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a national public outreach campaign—

(1) to educate United States businesses about the existence of the online toolkit and database established under section 6403; and

(2) to facilitate and encourage the participation of such businesses in the online toolkit and database.

(b) OUTREACH REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out the campaign under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) establish an advertising and outreach program directed to businesses, industries, State and local agencies, chambers of commerce, and labor organizations—

(A) to facilitate understanding of the value of an aggregated demand mapping system; and

(B) to advertise that the online toolkit described in section 6403(c) is available for that purpose;

(2) notify appropriate State agencies not later than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act regarding the development of the online toolkit; and

(3) post a notice on a publicly available website of the Department of Commerce and establish a social media awareness campaign to advertise the online toolkit.

(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the campaign under subsection (a), the Secretary may coordinate with other Federal agencies and State or local agencies as appropriate.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2024 to carry out this section.

(e) SEPARATE ACCOUNTING.—

(1) BUDGETARY LINE ITEM.—The Secretary shall include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Commerce budget for fiscal years 2023 and 2024 (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) specific identification, as a budgetary line item, of the amounts required to carry out the campaign under subsection (a).

(2) PROHIBITION ON COMMINGLING.—Amounts appropriated to carry out this section may not be commingled with any other amounts appropriated to the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 6405. ANALYSIS OF SUPPLY CHAIN VULNERABILITIES.

The Secretary shall use the information in the database described in section 6403(d) to identify and analyze vulnerabilities in the United States supply chains of the target industries that will result in a threat, if disrupted, to the national security, economic security, or public health of the United States.

SEC. 6406. USE OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary—

(1) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, construct the online toolkit and database established under section 6403, and related analytical features, using expertise within the Department of Commerce; and

(2) may, as appropriate, adopt new technologies and hire additional employees to carry out this title.

(b) MINIMIZATION OF CONTRACTING.—If the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) cannot be completed without the employment of contractors, the Secretary should seek to minimize the number of contractors and the scope of the contract.

SEC. 6407. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CYBERSECURITY INFRASTRUCTURE.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2024 for efforts relating to collecting and protecting information, and modernizing the technology infrastructure of the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 6408. TERMINATION.

This title shall terminate on September 30, 2026.

SA 1984. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division E, insert the following:

SEC. 52___. SHAREHOLDER NATIONAL SECURITY AWARENESS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Shareholder National Security Awareness Act of 2021''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The national security of the United States is a necessary condition for the advancement of the national public interest, the general welfare, and the volume of credit available for trade, industry, and transportation, which form the bases for the necessity of the regulation of transactions in securities, as described in section 2 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78b).

(2) Transactions in securities may adversely affect the national security of the United States in a manner that is analogous to the circumstances described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 2 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78b), which state that the unreasonable expansion and contraction of the volume of credit is caused by the susceptibility of the prices of securities to manipulation and control, excessive speculation, and sudden and unreasonable fluctuations.

(3) In the case of the national security of the United States, the susceptibility of the prices of securities to manipulation and control, excessive speculation, and sudden and unreasonable fluctuations may create business financing conditions that prevent, erode, or cause the abandonment of long-term investment that is necessary for the formation, development, and maintenance of capital assets that perform functions that are essential to the national security of the United States by—

(A) undervaluing those capital assets relative to their necessity to the United States; and

(B) overvaluing transactions that would reduce, downsize, outsource, or offshore the operation of those capital assets.

(4) In the report to Congress required under section 2504 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to fiscal year 2020, the Department of Defense stated that ''a U.S. business climate that has favored short-term shareholder earnings . . . [has] severely damaged America's ability to arm itself today and in the future''.

(5) The susceptibility of the prices of securities to manipulation and control, excessive speculation, and sudden and unreasonable fluctuations establishes, with respect to capital assets that are essential to the national

security of the United States, a justification for providing shareholders with greater information regarding the possible adverse effects of certain transactions on the national security of the United States in order to improve the stability, quality, and informational efficiency of the market for those capital assets.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CAUSE.—The term ''cause'' means to directly or indirectly cause.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(3) COMMITTEE.—The term ''Committee'' means the Committee for the Assessment of National Security in Corporate Governance established under subsection (g).

(4) COVERED PROVISION.—The term ''covered provision'' means subparagraph (F) of section 13(d)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(d)(1)), as added by subsection (d)(1) of this section.

(5) ISSUER.—The term ''issuer'' means an issuer with a class of securities registered pursuant to section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 781).

(6) NATIONAL SECURITY ASSET.—The term ''national security asset''—

(A) means an asset, the material reduction in the operation, the impairment, or the loss of which would harm the national security of the United States; and

(B) includes—

(i) any critical component, critical infrastructure, critical technology, critical technology item, and industrial resources, as those terms are defined in section 702 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4552);

(ii) critical infrastructure and critical technologies, as those terms are defined in paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 721(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(a)), respectively;

(iii) any intellectual property, or asset developed using intellectual property, that is developed through any program that has received funding, or that is authorized, under this Act; and

(iv) any facility or equipment developed through the program established under section 9902 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116–283).

(7) SHAREHOLDER PROPOSAL.—The term ''shareholder proposal'' means a proposal by a shareholder that the applicable issuer is required to include in the proxy statement of the issuer under section 240.14a–8 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(8) WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—The term ''within the United States'' means within the United States or any territory or possession of the United States.

(d) DISCLOSURE OF SHARE OWNERSHIP WITH RESPECT TO PLANS OR PROPOSALS AFFECTING NATIONAL SECURITY ASSETS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 13(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(d)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Any person who'' and inserting ''Subject to paragraph (7), any person who'';

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) whether such person has any plan or proposal that would be reasonably expected to, if implemented, cause a material reduction to the operation by the issuer of a national security asset, as all such applicable terms are defined in subsection (c) of the Shareholder National Security Awareness Act of 2021, within the United States or any territory or possession of the United States.'';

(B) in paragraph (6)(D), by inserting '', except that this subparagraph shall not apply with respect to an acquisition or proposed acquisition to which paragraph (1)(F) applies'' after ''purposes of this subsection''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) With respect to a person that has a plan or proposal described in paragraph (1)(F), this subsection shall be applied by substituting '2.5 per centum' for '5 per centum' each place that term appears.''.

(2) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall amend section 240.13d–101 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, to ensure that such section is consistent with the covered provision.

(e) RULEMAKINGS REGARDING REVIEW OF THE EFFECT OF PROXY SOLICITATIONS AND PROPOSALS ON NATIONAL SECURITY ASSETS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall—

(1) amend section 240.14a–2(b)(1)(vi) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, to provide that a person that is required to file a statement described in the covered provision is included as a person described in such section 240.14a–2(b)(1)(vi); and

(2) issue rules that permit an issuer to exclude from any proxy statement supplied by the issuer any shareholder proposal that would be reasonably expected to, if implemented, cause a material reduction to the operation by the issuer of a national security asset.

(f) REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE.—With respect to any material reviewed, or determination required to be made, by the Commission under a rule issued or amended under subsection (d)(2) or (e), the Commission may refer the matter to the Committee, which shall review the matter in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of subsection (g).

(g) COMMITTEE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY IN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Committee for the Assessment of National Security in Corporate Governance, the primary objective of which shall be to assist the Commission in the review by the Commission of matters relating to national security, including the covered provision and matters relating to any rule issued or amended under subsection (d)(2) or (e).

(2) COMPOSITION.—The Committee shall be composed of the following members:

(A) The Secretary of Defense.

(B) The Attorney General.

(C) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

(D) The Secretary of Commerce.

(E) The United States Trade Representative.

(F) The Secretary of State.

(3) CHAIR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall serve as Chair of the Committee.

(B) DUTIES OF THE CHAIR.—The Chair shall—

(i) except as otherwise provided by this section, or the amendments made by this section, have the exclusive authority to act, or to authorize other members of the Committee to act, on behalf of the Committee, including communicating with the Commission and with persons subject to the reviews authorized under paragraph (4); and

(ii) in acting on behalf of the Committee—

(I) keep the Committee fully informed of the activities of the Chair; and

(II) consult with the Committee before taking any material actions under paragraph (4).

(4) DUTIES.—

(A) REVIEW OF SHARE OWNERSHIP DISCLOSURE AND SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS.—Not later than 45 days after the date on which the Commission refers a matter to the Committee under subsection (f), the Committee shall—

(i) conduct a review to determine, based on a written, risk-based analysis, whether the plan or proposal that is the subject of the referred matter would be reasonably expected to, if implemented, cause a material reduction to the operation by the applicable issuer of a national security asset within the United States; and

(ii) communicate to the Commission any determination made by the Committee under clause (i).

(B) COMMUNICATION.—The Committee may—

(i) communicate directly with any person that is the subject of a review under this paragraph; and

(ii) submit to any person described in clause (i) any questions or requests for information to establish facts necessary to conduct a review described in that clause.

(C) TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES.—In making any determination under this paragraph regarding whether a plan or proposal would reasonably be expected to, if implemented, cause a material reduction to the operation by the issuer of a national security asset, the Committee may consider any of the following:

(i) The totality of the circumstances with respect to the plan or proposal, including—

(I) consideration of whether, in taking a separate action, the person to which the determination applies is—

(aa) planning or proposing a material increase with respect to the operation of the applicable national security asset or any other national security asset; or

(bb) creating or developing any new asset relating to the national security of the United States that would offset the material reduction with respect to the operation of the national security asset; and

(II) whether that material reduction is caused by—

(aa) any sale of, or other disposition of (whether in a single transaction or a series of transactions) assets or capital stock;

(bb) any merger, consolidation, joint venture, partnership, spin-off, reverse spin-off, dissolution, restructuring, recapitalization, liquidation, or any other business combination or strategic transaction; or

(cc) any other transaction or event the Committee determines appropriate.

(ii) The totality of the circumstances with respect to the operation of the national security asset, including—

(I) the amount of time in operation of the applicable asset;

(II) the number, amount, or quality of inputs, whether from labor, energy, or other sources, contributing to the operation of the applicable asset;

(III) the number, amount, or quality of outputs, whether in the form of labor, components, or end-use products, that result from the operation of the applicable asset; and

(IV) any other measurement with respect to the operation that the Committee determines appropriate.

(D) PRESUMPTION OF MATERIAL REDUCTION.—With respect to any review conducted by the Committee under this paragraph, there shall be a presumption, which may be rebutted through any information received by the Committee through communication permitted under subparagraph (B), that the

plan or proposal that is the subject of the review would be reasonably expected to, if implemented, cause a material reduction to the operation by the applicable issuer of a national security asset if that plan or proposal would, if implemented, cause—

(i) in a fiscal year, distributions , including capital distributions, with respect to the common stock of the issuer to exceed the net income of the issuer with respect to any of the 3 most recently completed fiscal years of the issuer;

(ii) the sale of any material line of business of the issuer with respect to which the issuer has, or had in any of the 3 most recently completed fiscal years of the issuer, a contract with the Federal Government; or

(iii) a reduction in expenditures on research and development by the issuer in an amount that is more than 50 percent, as compared with the amount of those expenditures in any of the 3 most recently completed fiscal years of the issuer.

(5) CONSENSUS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall attempt to reach consensus with respect to determinations made under paragraph (4).

(B) INABILITY TO REACH CONSENSUS.—If the Committee is unable to reach consensus, as described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) the Chair shall present the issue to the Committee, which shall make a determination by majority vote; and

(ii) if the vote of the Committee under clause (i) is a tie, the Chair shall make the final decision regarding the applicable determination.

(C) PUBLICLY AVAILABLE VERSION OF DETERMINATION.—The Committee shall publish publicly a version of any determination made under paragraph (4) that provides the reasoning for the determination, which may have removed classified or other sensitive information from the determination or any analysis from the determination.

(D) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(i) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—The Attorney General shall provide such funding and administrative support for the Committee as the Committee may require.

(ii) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—The heads of executive departments and agencies shall provide, as appropriate and to the extent permitted by law, such resources, information, and assistance as required to implement the reviews required by paragraph (4) within their respective agencies, including the assignment of staff to perform the duties described in this subsection.

(6) INAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply with respect to the Committee or the activities of the Committee.

SA 1985. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 25_____. NATIONAL STRATEGIC URANIUM RESERVE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) URANIUM RESERVE.—The term ''Uranium Reserve'' means the uranium reserve operated pursuant to the program established under subsection (b).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Energy.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a program to operate a uranium reserve comprised of uranium recovered in the United States in accordance with this section.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Uranium Reserve are—

(1) to address domestic nuclear supply chain issues;

(2) to provide assurance of the availability of uranium recovered in the United States in the event of a supply disruption; and

(3) to support strategic nuclear fuel cycle capabilities in the United States.

(d) EXCLUSION.—The Secretary shall exclude from the Uranium Reserve uranium that is recovered in the United States by an entity that—

(1) is owned or controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation or the Government of the People's Republic of China; or

(2) is organized under the laws of, or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of, the Russian Federation or the People's Republic of China.

(e) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, of the amounts authorized in section 2117(a), $150,000,000 is authorized for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out this section.

SA 1986. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 25___. HA-LEU BANK.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HA-LEU.—The term ''HA-LEU'' means high-assay, low-enriched uranium.

(2) HA-LEU BANK.—The term ''HA-LEU Bank'' means the HA-LEU Bank operated pursuant to the program established under subsection (b).

(3) HIGH-ASSAY, LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM.—The term ''high-assay, low-enriched uranium'' means uranium having an assay greater than 5.0 weight percent and less than 20.0 weight percent of the uranium-235 isotope.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Energy.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a program to operate a HA-LEU Bank in accordance with this section.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the HA-LEU Bank are—

(1) to provide for the availability of domestically produced HA-LEU;

(2) to address domestic nuclear supply chain issues; and

(3) to support strategic nuclear fuel cycle capabilities in the United States.

(d) EXCLUSION.—The Secretary shall exclude from the HA-LEU Bank uranium that is enriched by an entity that—

(1) is owned or controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation or the Government of the People's Republic of China; or

(2) is organized under the laws of, or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of, the Russian Federation or the People's Republic of China.

(e) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, of the amounts authorized in section 2117(a), $150,000,000 is authorized for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out this section.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2001(a)(2)(D) of the Energy Act of 2020 (42 U.S.C. 16281(a)(2)(D)) is amended—

(1) in clause (v)(III), by adding ''or'' after the semicolon at the end;

(2) by striking clause (vi); and

(3) by redesignating clause (vii) as clause (vi).

SA 1987. Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In title V of division B, at the end add the following:

SEC. 25___. GRANTS FOR RESEARCHING COVID–19 ORIGINS.

(a) AWARDS.—Out of amounts made available to the Foundation under section 2116 for activities outside of the Directorate, the Director shall award grants to entities described in subsection (b) for the purpose of researching the origins of COVID–19, including researching any evidence of whether COVID–19—

(1) was in any way manufactured;

(2) escaped from a laboratory; or

(3) involved a zoonotic origin.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An entity described in this subsection is an entity that—

(1) is based in the United States; and

(2) submits a proposal to the Director for a grant under this section, which shall ensure that the entity complies, and all activities supported through the grant will comply, with all policies and procedures with respect to research security under title III, including by complying with the policy guidelines under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2303(a) with respect to prohibitions on participation in a foreign government talent recruitment program of the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, or the Islamic Republic of Iran as described in such paragraphs.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through the year following the date described in subsection (d), the Director shall provide to Congress, and make publicly available, a report on the findings of the research supported through the grants under this section.

(d) SUNSET.—The authority for the Director to make grants under this section shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1988. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2507(b)(3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), insert ", subject to the availability of appropriations" after "may".

In section 2507(b)(3)(C), strike "by any prior or subsequent Act,".

In section 2507(b), add at the end the following:

(5) LIMITATION.—The authorities provided for under paragraph (3), and the requirements thereof, shall be in addition to any other authorities provided under the law.

SA 1989. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division F, insert the following:

SEC. ___. WORKER OWNERSHIP, READINESS, AND KNOWLEDGE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXISTING PROGRAM.—The term "existing program" means a program, designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking, that exists on the date on which the Secretary is carrying out a responsibility authorized under this section.

(2) INITIATIVE.—The term "Initiative" means the Employee Ownership and Participation Initiative established under subsection (b).

(3) NEW PROGRAM.—The term "new program" means a program, designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking, that does not exist on the date on which the Secretary is carrying out a responsibility authorized under this section.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(5) STATE.—The term "State" has the meaning given the term under section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).

(b) EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION INITIATIVE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish within the Department of Labor an Employee Ownership and Participation Initiative to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall—

(A) support within the States existing programs designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking; and

(B) facilitate within the States the formation of new programs designed to promote employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking.

(3) DUTIES.—To carry out the functions enumerated in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

(A) support new programs and existing programs by—

(i) making Federal grants authorized under subsection (d); and

(ii)(I) acting as a clearinghouse on techniques employed by new programs and existing programs within the States, and disseminating information relating to those techniques to the programs; or

(II) funding projects for information gathering on those techniques, and dissemination of that information to the programs, by groups outside the Department of Labor; and

(B) facilitate the formation of new programs, in ways that include holding or funding an annual conference of representatives from States with existing programs, representatives from States developing new programs, and representatives from States without existing programs.

(c) PROGRAMS REGARDING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a program to encourage new programs and existing programs within the States to foster employee ownership and employee participation in business decisionmaking throughout the United States.

(2) PURPOSE OF PROGRAM.—The purpose of the program established under paragraph (1) is to encourage new and existing programs within the States that focus on—

(A) providing education and outreach to inform employees and employers about the possibilities and benefits of employee ownership, business ownership succession planning, and employee participation in business decisionmaking, including providing information about financial education, employee teams, open-book management, and other tools that enable employees to share ideas and information about how their businesses can succeed;

(B) providing technical assistance to assist employee efforts to become business owners, to enable employers and employees to explore and assess the feasibility of transferring full or partial ownership to employees, and to encourage employees and employers to start new employee-owned businesses;

(C) training employees and employers with respect to methods of employee participation in open-book management, work teams, committees, and other approaches for seeking greater employee input; and

(D) training other entities to apply for funding under this subsection, to establish new programs, and to carry out program activities.

(3) PROGRAM DETAILS.—The Secretary may include, in the program established under paragraph (1), provisions that—

(A) in the case of activities described in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) target key groups, such as retiring business owners, senior managers, unions, trade associations, community organizations, and economic development organizations;

(ii) encourage cooperation in the organization of workshops and conferences; and

(iii) prepare and distribute materials concerning employee ownership and participation, and business ownership succession planning;

(B) in the case of activities described in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) provide preliminary technical assistance to employee groups, managers, and retiring owners exploring the possibility of employee ownership;

(ii) provide for the performance of preliminary feasibility assessments;

(iii) assist in the funding of objective third-party feasibility studies and preliminary business valuations, and in selecting and monitoring professionals qualified to conduct such studies; and

(iv) provide a data bank to help employees find legal, financial, and technical advice in connection with business ownership;

(C) in the case of activities described in paragraph (2)(C)—

(i) provide for courses on employee participation; and

(ii) provide for the development and fostering of networks of employee-owned companies to spread the use of successful participation techniques; and

(D) in the case of training described in paragraph (2)(D)—

(i) provide for visits to existing programs by staff from new programs receiving funding under this section; and

(ii) provide materials to be used for such training.

(4) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall issue formal guidance, for recipients of grants awarded under subsection (d) and one-stop partners (as defined in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102)) affiliated with the workforce development systems (as so defined) of the States, proposing that programs and other activities funded under this section be—

(A) proactive in encouraging actions and activities that promote employee ownership of, and participation in, businesses; and

(B) comprehensive in emphasizing both employee ownership of, and participation in, businesses so as to increase productivity and broaden capital ownership.

(d) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (c), the Secretary may make grants for use in connection with new programs and existing programs within a State for any of the following activities:

(A) Education and outreach as provided in subsection (c)(2)(A).

(B) Technical assistance as provided in subsection (c)(2)(B).

(C) Training activities for employees and employers as provided in subsection (c)(2)(C).

(D) Activities facilitating cooperation among employee-owned firms.

(E) Training as provided in subsection (c)(2)(D) for new programs provided by participants in existing programs dedicated to the objectives of this section, except that, for each fiscal year, the amount of the grants made for such training shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount of the grants made under this section.

(2) AMOUNTS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall determine the amount and any conditions for a grant made under this subsection. The amount of the grant shall be subject to paragraph (6), and shall reflect the capacity of the applicant for the grant.

(3) APPLICATIONS.—Each entity desiring a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(4) STATE APPLICATIONS.—Each State may sponsor and submit an application under

paragraph (3) on behalf of any local entity consisting of a unit of State or local government, State-supported institution of higher education, or nonprofit organization, meeting the requirements of this section.

(5) APPLICATIONS BY ENTITIES.—

(A) ENTITY APPLICATIONS.—If a State fails to support or establish a program pursuant to this section during any fiscal year, the Secretary shall, in the subsequent fiscal years, allow local entities described in paragraph (4) from that State to make applications for grants under paragraph (3) on their own initiative.

(B) APPLICATION SCREENING.—Any State failing to support or establish a program pursuant to this section during any fiscal year may submit applications under paragraph (3) in the subsequent fiscal years but may not screen applications by local entities described in paragraph (4) before submitting the applications to the Secretary.

(6) LIMITATIONS.—A recipient of a grant made under this subsection shall not receive, during a fiscal year, in the aggregate, more than the following amounts:

(A) For fiscal year 2022, $300,000.

(B) For fiscal year 2023, $330,000.

(C) For fiscal year 2024, $363,000.

(D) For fiscal year 2025, $399,300.

(E) For fiscal year 2026, $439,200.

(7) ANNUAL REPORT.—For each year, each recipient of a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary a report describing how grant funds allocated pursuant to this subsection were expended during the 12-month period preceding the date of the submission of the report.

(e) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to reserve not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this section, for the purposes of conducting evaluations of the grant programs identified in subsection (d) and to provide related technical assistance.

(f) REPORTING.—Not later than the expiration of the 36-month period following the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report—

(1) on progress related to employee ownership and participation in businesses in the United States; and

(2) containing an analysis of critical costs and benefits of activities carried out under this section.

(g) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants pursuant to subsection (d) the following:

(A) For fiscal year 2022, $4,000,000.

(B) For fiscal year 2023, $7,000,000.

(C) For fiscal year 2024, $10,000,000.

(D) For fiscal year 2025, $13,000,000.

(E) For fiscal year 2026, $16,000,000.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of funding the administrative expenses related to the Initiative, for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, an amount not in excess of the lesser of—

(A) $350,000; or

(B) 5.0 percent of the maximum amount available under paragraph (1) for that fiscal year.

SA 1990. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. ROSEN) 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:

SEC. ___. REGIONAL INNOVATION CLUSTERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(2) ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATION.—The term ''Alaska Native Corporation'' has the meaning given the term ''Native Corporation'' in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602).

(3) AWARD.—The term ''award'' means a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement.

(4) CLUSTER INITIATIVE.—The term ''Cluster Initiative'' means a formally organized effort to promote the growth and competitiveness of an industry sector through collaborative activities among Industry Cluster participants that is led by—

(A) a State;

(B) an Indian Tribe, an Alaska Native Corporation, or a Native Hawaiian Organization;

(C) a city or other political subdivision of a State;

(D) a nonprofit organization, including an institution of higher education or a venture development organization; or

(E) a small business concern.

(5) INDUSTRY CLUSTER.—The term ''Industry Cluster'' means a geographic concentration, relative to the size of the region under consideration, of interconnected businesses, suppliers, service providers, and associated institutions in an industry sector, including advanced manufacturing, precision agriculture, cybersecurity, biosciences, water technologies, energy production and efficiency, and outdoor recreation.

(6) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian Tribe'' has the meaning given the term ''Indian tribe'' in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(7) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(8) NATIVE HAWAIIAN ORGANIZATION.—The term ''Native Hawaiian Organization'' has the meaning given the term in section 8(a)(15) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)).

(9) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term ''small business concern'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(10) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

(b) SUPPORTING INDUSTRY CLUSTERS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Administrator shall make awards to Cluster Initiatives that strengthen Industry Clusters in accordance with the requirements under this subsection.

(2) INDUSTRY CLUSTER OUTCOMES.—Cluster Initiatives shall be assessed according to their performance along the following metrics:

(A) Growth in number of small business concerns participating in the Industry Cluster and support industries.

(B) Growth in number of small business concern startups in the Industry Cluster.

(C) Growth in total capital, including revenue and equity investments, flowing to small business concern participants in the Industry Cluster.

(D) Growth in job creation by small business concerns or, in regions with declining total employment, job retention by small business concerns in the Industry Cluster.

(E) Growth in new products, services, or business lines.

(F) Growth in new technologies developed within the Industry Cluster.

(3) REPORTING.—The Administrator shall require Cluster Initiatives to submit annual reports documenting the outcomes in paragraph (2) and the activities contributing to those outcomes.

(4) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In making awards to Cluster Initiatives under this subsection, the Administrator shall consider—

(A) the probable impact of the Cluster Initiative on the competitiveness of the Industry Cluster, including—

(i) whether the Cluster Initiative will be inclusive of any and all organizations that might benefit from participation, including startups, small business concerns not locally owned, and small business concerns rival to existing members of the Industry Cluster; and

(ii) whether the Cluster Initiative will encourage broad participation by and collaboration among all types of participants;

(B) if the proposed Cluster Initiative fits within a broader and achievable economic development strategy;

(C) the capacity and commitment of the sponsoring organization of the Cluster Initiative organization, including—

(i) the expected ability of the Cluster Initiative to access additional funds from other sources; and

(ii) the capacity of the Cluster Initiative to sustain activities once grant funds have been expended;

(D) the degree of involvement from relevant State and regional economic and workforce development organizations, other public purpose institutions (such as universities, community colleges, venture development organizations, and workforce boards), and the private sector, including industry associations;

(E) the extent to which economic diversity across regions of the United States would be increased through the award; and

(F) the geographic distribution of Cluster Initiatives around the United States.

(5) INITIAL AWARD.—The Administrator may make a 1-year award not to exceed $1,000,000 with each Cluster Initiative.

(6) RENEWAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may renew an award made to a Cluster Initiative under paragraph (5)—

(i) for 1 year in an amount not to exceed $750,000 per year; and

(ii) for a total period not to exceed 5 years.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—A Cluster Initiative shall compete in a new funding opportunity to receive any further awards under this subsection.

(7) MATCHING FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving an award under this subsection, a Cluster Initiative shall provide 1 dollar in non-Federal matching funds, including in-kind contributions, for every 2 dollars received under the award.

(B) WAIVER.—The Administrator may waive part of the matching funds requirement under subparagraph (A) for a Cluster Initiative that—

(i) has not previously received an award under this subsection; or

(ii) supports a noncore area, a micropolitan area, or a small metropolitan statistical area with a population of not more than 200,000.

(8) COMPETITIVE PROCESS.—The Administrator shall enter into new awards under this

subsection for each year that appropriations are available.

(c) FEASIBILITY STUDY AWARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may make awards for feasibility studies, planning, and operations to support the launch of new Cluster Initiatives.

(2) AMOUNT.—The total amount of awards made under paragraph (1) shall not exceed $250,000.

(3) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Administrator may make awards under paragraph (1) to—

(A) a State;

(B) an Indian Tribe, an Alaska Native Corporation, or a Native Hawaiian Organization;

(C) a city or other political subdivision of a State;

(D) a nonprofit organization, including an institution of higher education or a venture development organization; or

(E) a consortium consisting of entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 and each subsequent fiscal year to carry out this section.

SA 1991. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division C, add the following:

SEC. 3314. INVESTIGATIONS OF ALLEGATIONS OF GOODS PRODUCED BY FORCED LABOR.

Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307) is amended—

(1) by striking ''All'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—All'';

(2) by striking '' 'Forced labor', as herein used, shall mean'' and inserting the following:

''(c) FORCED LABOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'forced labor' means''; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a), as designated by paragraph (1), the following:

''(b) FORCED LABOR DIVISION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Office of Trade of U.S. Customs and Border Protection a Forced Labor Division, which shall—

''(A) receive and investigate allegations of goods, wares, articles, or merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured using forced labor; and

''(B) coordinate with other agencies to enforce the prohibition under subsection (a).

''(2) PRIORITIZATION OF INVESTIGATIONS.—In prioritizing investigations under paragraph (1)(A), the Forced Labor Division shall—

''(A) consult closely with the Bureau of International Labor Affairs of the Department of Labor and the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons of the Department of State; and

''(B) take into account—

''(i) the complicity of—

''(I) the government of the foreign county in which the instance of forced labor is alleged to have occurred; and

''(II) the government of any other country that has facilitated the use of forced labor in the country described in subclause (I);

''(ii) the ranking of the governments described in clause (i) in the most recent report on trafficking in persons required by section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1));

''(iii) whether the good involved in the alleged instance of forced labor is included in the most recent list of goods produced by child labor or forced labor required by section 105(b)(1)(2)(C) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7112(b)(2)(C)); and

''(iv) the effect taking action with respect to the alleged instance of forced labor would have in eradicating forced labor from the supply chain of the United States.

''(3) QUARTERLY BRIEFINGS REQUIRED.—Not less frequently than every 90 days, the Forced Labor Division shall provide briefings to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives regarding—

''(A) allegations received under paragraph (1);

''(B) the prioritization of investigations of such allegations under paragraph (2); and

''(C) progress made toward—

''(i) issuing withhold release orders for goods, wares, articles, or merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured using forced labor; and

''(ii) making findings in and closing investigations conducted under paragraph (1).''.

SA 1992. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. CENSORSHIP AS A TRADE BARRIER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 8 of title I of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 183. IDENTIFICATION OF COUNTRIES THAT DISRUPT DIGITAL TRADE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the National Trade Estimate is submitted under section 181(b), the United States Trade Representative (in this section referred to as the 'Trade Representative') shall identify, in accordance with subsection (b), foreign countries that are trading partners of the United States that engage in acts, policies, or practices that disrupt digital trade activities, including—

''(1) coerced censorship in their own markets or extraterritorially; and

''(2) other eCommerce or digital practices with the goal, or substantial effect, of promoting censorship or extrajudicial data access that disadvantages United States persons.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR IDENTIFICATIONS.—In identifying countries under subsection (a), the Trade Representative shall identify only foreign countries that—

''(1) disrupt digital trade in a discriminatory or trade distorting manner with the goal, or substantial effect, of promoting censorship or extrajudicial data access;

''(2) deny fair and equitable market access to digital service providers that are United States persons with the goal, or substantial effect, of promoting censorship or extrajudicial data access; or

''(3) engage in coerced censorship or extrajudicial data access so as to harm the integrity of services or products provided by United States persons in the market of that country, the United States market, or other markets.

''(c) DESIGNATION OF PRIORITY FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Trade Representative shall designate as priority foreign countries the foreign countries identified under subsection (a) that—

''(A) engage in the most onerous or egregious acts, policies, or practices that have the greatest impact on the United States; and

''(B) are not negotiating or otherwise making progress to end those acts, policies, or practices.

''(2) REVOCATIONS AND ADDITIONAL IDENTIFICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Trade Representative may at any time, if information available to the Trade Representative indicates that such action is appropriate—

''(i) revoke the identification of any foreign country as a priority foreign country under paragraph (1); or

''(ii) identify any foreign country as a priority foreign country under that paragraph.

''(B) REPORT ON REASONS FOR REVOCATION.—The Trade Representative shall include in the semiannual report submitted to Congress under section 309(3) a detailed explanation of the reasons for the revocation under subparagraph (A) of the identification of any foreign country as a priority foreign country under paragraph (1) during the period covered by the report.

''(d) REFERRAL TO ATTORNEY GENERAL OR INVESTIGATION.—If the Trade Representative identifies an instance in which a foreign country designated as a priority foreign country under subsection (c) has successfully pressured an online service provider to inhibit free speech in the United States, the Trade Representative shall—

''(1) submit to Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report detailing the precise circumstances of the instance, including the actions taken by the foreign country and the online service provider;

''(2) if the online service provider is under the jurisdiction of the United States, refer the instance to the Attorney General; and

''(3) if appropriate, initiate an investigation under section 302 and impose a remedy under section 301(c).

''(e) PUBLICATION.—The Trade Representative shall publish in the Federal Register a list of foreign countries identified under subsection (a) and foreign countries designated as priority foreign countries under subsection (c) and shall make such revisions to the list as may be required by reason of action under subsection (c)(2).

''(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Trade Representative submits the National Trade Estimate under section 181(b), the Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on actions taken under this section during the one-year period preceding that report, and the reasons for those actions, including—

''(1) a list of any foreign countries identified under subsection (a); and

''(2) a description of progress made in decreasing disruptions to digital trade.''.

(b) INVESTIGATIONS UNDER TITLE III OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 302(b)(2) of the

Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2412(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''or designated as a priority foreign country under section 183(c)'' after ''section 182(a)(2)''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''by reason of subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''with respect to a country identified under section 182(a)(2)''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 182 the following:

''Sec. 183. Identification of countries that disrupt digital trade.''.

SA 1993. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. INVESTIGATION OF CENSORSHIP AND BARRIERS TO DIGITAL TRADE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking ''If the Trade Representative'' and inserting ''(1) If the Trade Representative'';

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), an act, policy, or practice that is unreasonable includes any act, policy, or practice, or any combination of acts, policies, or practices, that denies fair and equitable market opportunities, including through censorship or barriers to the provision of domestic digital services, by the government of a foreign country that—

''(A) precludes competition by conferring special benefits on domestic entities or imposing discriminatory burdens on foreign entities;

''(B) provides inconsistent or unfair market access to United States persons;

''(C) requires censorship of content that originates in the United States; or

''(D) requires extrajudicial data access that disadvantages United States persons.''.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTION.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) In the case of an act, policy, or practice described in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) by the government of a foreign country that is determined to be unreasonable under paragraph (1) of that subsection, the Trade Representative may direct the blocking of access from that country to data from the United States to address the lack of reciprocal market access or parallel data flows.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 304(a)(1)(A)(ii) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2414(a)(1)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking ''(b)(1)'' and inserting ''(b)(1)(A)''.

SA 1994. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 478, strike line 17, and all that follows through page 485, line 18, and insert the following:

SEC. 2527. BASIC RESEARCH.

(a) NONDISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS OF GRANT REVIEW PANEL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each agency that awards a Federal research grant shall not disclose, either publicly or privately, to an applicant for such grant the identity of any member of the grant review panel for such applicant.

(b) PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY OF RESEARCH FUNDED BY TAXPAYERS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF FEDERAL AGENCY.—In this section, the term ''Federal agency'' means an Executive agency, as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) FEDERAL RESEARCH PUBLIC ACCESS POLICY.—

(A) REQUIREMENT TO DEVELOP POLICY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, each Federal agency with annual extramural research expenditures of over $100,000,000 shall have an agency research public access policy that is consistent with and advances the goals of the Federal agency.

(ii) COMMON PROCEDURES.—Where appropriate, Federal agencies required to develop a policy under clause (i) shall follow common procedures for ensuring access to research papers to minimize compliance burdens and costs and avoid unnecessary duplication of existing mechanisms.

(B) CONTENT.—Each Federal research public access policy shall provide for—

(i) submission to a digital repository or access through a system that achieves the goals of this section designated or maintained by the Federal agency of an electronic version of the accepted manuscript of original research papers that have been accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and that result from research supported, in whole or in part, from funding by the Federal Government;

(ii) the incorporation of any changes resulting from the peer review process in the accepted manuscript described under clause (i);

(iii) the replacement of the accepted manuscript with the final published version if—

(I) the publisher consents to the replacement; and

(II) the goals of the Federal agency for functionality and interoperability are retained; and

(iv) free online public access to such accepted manuscripts or final published versions within a time period that is appropriate for each type of research conducted or sponsored by the Federal agency, not later than 12 months after the official date of publication in peer-reviewed journals.

(C) APPLICATION OF POLICY.—Each Federal research public access policy shall—

(i) apply to—

(I) researchers employed by the Federal agency whose works remain in the public domain; and

(II) researchers funded by the Federal agency; and

(ii) provide that works described under clause (i)(I) shall be—

(I) marked as being public domain material when published; and

(II) made available at the same time such works are made available under subparagraph (B)(iv).

(D) EXCLUSIONS.—Each Federal research public access policy shall not apply to—

(i) research progress reports presented at professional meetings or conferences;

(ii) laboratory notes, preliminary data analyses, notes of the author, phone logs, or other information used to produce accepted manuscripts;

(iii) classified research, research resulting in works that generate revenue or royalties for authors (such as books) or patentable discoveries, to the extent necessary to protect a copyright or patent; or

(iv) authors who do not submit their work to a journal or works that are rejected by journals.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING PATENT OR COPYRIGHT LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any exclusive right under the provisions of title 17 or 35, United States Code.

(4) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 5 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that—

(A) includes an analysis of the period between the date on which articles generally become publicly available in a journal and the date on which the accepted manuscript is in the online repository of the applicable Federal agency;

(B) examines the effectiveness of the Federal research public access policy in providing the public with free online access to papers on research funded by each Federal agency required to develop a policy under paragraph (2)(A); and

(C) examines the impact of the Federal research public access policy on the availability, quality, integrity, and sustainability of scholarly communication and on the degree to which policies avoid unnecessary duplication of existing mechanisms.

(5) DOWNSTREAM REPORTING.—Any person or institution awarded a grant from a Federal research agency shall—

(A) notify and seek authorization from the relevant agency for any funds derived from the grant made available through a subgrant or subsequent grant (including to an employee or subdivision of the grant recipient's organization); and

(B) ensure that each subgrant or subsequent grant award (including to an employee or subdivision of the grant recipient's organization) funded with funds derived from the Federal grant is within the scope of the Federal grant award.

(6) IMPARTIALITY IN FUNDING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each Federal agency, in awarding grants for scientific research, shall be impartial and shall not seek to advance any political position or fund a grant to reach a predetermined conclusion.

SEC. 2528. GAO STUDY ON OVERSIGHT OF FEDERAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY GRANT MAKING AND INVESTMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) in instances such as the Troubled Asset Relief Program, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Iraq, and Afghanistan, Congress has created special inspectors general and other oversight entities focused on particular program areas who have performed in outstanding ways;

(2) the oversight entities described in paragraph (1) have helped to strengthen oversight

in cross-agency activities and where component inspectors general may have otherwise faced significant challenges;

(3) because of the cross-agency nature of Federal science and technology activities, Congress created the Office of Science and Technology Policy to coordinate and harmonize among science functions at agencies;

(4) the United States innovation ecosystem, which uses multiple science agencies to invest in research and development, can make it more difficult to identify and remove scientists who violate research integrity principles;

(5) the single agency jurisdiction of an agency inspector general can be a disadvantage with respect to their oversight roles, and opportunities to strengthen the system may exist;

(6) single agency jurisdiction of inspectors general may also make it difficult to harmonize principles and standards for oversight of waste, fraud, and abuse among agencies; and

(7) certain issues of fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal science and technology activities span multiple agencies and are more apparent through cross-agency oversight.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit to Congress a report that—

(1) evaluates the frequency of cases of waste, fraud, or abuse perpetrated across multiple Federal science agencies by an awardee or group of awardees;

(2) evaluates the effectiveness of existing mechanisms to detect waste, fraud, and abuse perpetrated across multiple Federal science agencies by an awardee or group of awardees; and

(3) evaluates options for strengthening detection of waste, fraud, and abuse perpetrated across multiple Federal science agencies by an awardee or group of awardees, including by examining the benefits and drawbacks of—

(A) providing additional support to agency inspectors general with regard to coordinated oversight of Federal and technology grant making investments; and

(B) alternative mechanisms for strengthening prevention and detection of waste, fraud, and abuse across Federal science agencies perpetrated across multiple Federal science agencies by an awardee or group of awardees, such as the establishment of a special inspector general or other mechanisms as the Comptroller General sees fit.

SA 1995. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. TECHNICAL AND LEGAL SUPPORT FOR ADDRESSING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS INFRINGEMENT CASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of any Federal agency may provide support, as requested and appropriate, to United States persons seeking technical, legal, or other support in addressing intellectual property rights infringement cases regarding the People's Republic of China.

(b) UNITED STATES PERSON DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''United States person'' means—

(1) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(2) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SA 1996. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. AUTHORITY OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION TO CONSOLIDATE, MODIFY, OR REORGANIZE CUSTOMS REVENUE FUNCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 412 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 212(b)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''consolidate, discontinue,'' and inserting ''discontinue''; and

(ii) by inserting after ''reduce the staffing level'' the following: ''below the optimal staffing level determined in the most recent Resource Allocation Model required by section 301(h) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(h))''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', National Account Managers'' after ''Financial Systems Specialists''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) AUTHORITY TO CONSOLIDATE, MODIFY, OR REORGANIZE CUSTOMS REVENUE FUNCTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may, subject to subsection (b), consolidate, modify, or reorganize customs revenue functions delegated to the Commissioner under subsection (a), including by adding such functions to existing positions or establishing new or modifying existing job series, grades, titles, or classifications for personnel, and associated support staff, performing such functions.

''(2) POSITION CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS.—At the request of the Commissioner, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall establish new position classification standards for any new positions established by the Commissioner under paragraph (1).''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 412(a)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 212(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''403(a)(1)'' and inserting ''403(1)''.

SA 1997. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division C, add the following:

SEC. 3314. PREVENTING IMPORTATION OF SEAFOOD AND SEAFOOD PRODUCTS HARVESTED OR PRODUCED USING FORCED LABOR.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CHILD LABOR.—The term ''child labor'' has the meaning given the term ''worst forms of child labor'' in section 507 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2467).

(2) FORCED LABOR.—The term ''forced labor'' has the meaning given that term in section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

(3) HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The term ''human trafficking'' has the meaning given the term ''severe forms of trafficking in persons'' in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(4) SEAFOOD.—The term ''seafood'' means fish, shellfish, processed fish, fish meal, shellfish products, and all other forms of marine animal and plant life other than marine mammals and birds.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(b) FORCED LABOR IN FISHING.—

(1) RULEMAKING.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in coordination with the Secretary, shall issue regulations regarding the verification of seafood imports to ensure that no seafood or seafood product harvested or produced using forced labor is entered into the United States in violation of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

(2) STRATEGY.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in coordination with the Secretary and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, shall—

(A) develop a strategy for using data collected under Seafood Import Monitoring Program to identify seafood imports at risk of being harvested or produced using forced labor; and

(B) publish information regarding the strategy developed under subparagraph (A) on the website of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(c) INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative, in coordination with the Secretary of Commerce, shall engage with interested countries regarding the development of compatible and effective seafood tracking and sustainability plans in order to—

(1) identify best practices;

(2) coordinate regarding data sharing;

(3) reduce barriers to trade in fairly grown or harvested fish; and

(4) end the trade in products that—

(A) are harvested or produced using illegal, unregulated, or unreported fishing, human trafficking, or forced labor; or

(B) pose a risk of fraud.

SA 1998. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and

Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division B, add the following:

SEC. 2309. IMMIGRATION CONSEQUENCES OF TRADE SECRET THEFT AND ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Stop Theft of Intellectual Property Act of 2021''.

(b) IN GENERAL.—

(1) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) SECURITY AND RELATED GROUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any alien who a consular officer, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Attorney General knows, or has reasonable ground to believe, seeks to enter the United States to engage solely, principally, or incidentally in—

''(i) any activity to violate any law of the United States relating to espionage or sabotage;

''(ii) any activity to violate or evade any law prohibiting the export from the United States of goods, technology, or sensitive information;

''(iii) any activity to violate any law of the United States or of any State relating to the theft or misappropriation of trade secrets or economic espionage;

''(iv) any other unlawful activity; or

''(v) any activity, a purpose of which is the opposition to, or the control or overthrow of, the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unlawful means,

is inadmissible.''.

(2) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(4)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any alien who has engaged, is engaged, or at any time after admission, engages in—

''(i) any activity to violate any law of the United States relating to espionage or sabotage;

''(ii) any activity to violate or evade any law prohibiting the export from the United States of goods, technology, or sensitive information;

''(iii) any activity to violate any law of the United States or of any State relating to the theft or misappropriation of trade secrets or economic espionage;

''(iv) any other criminal activity that endangers public safety or national security; or

''(v) any activity, a purpose of which is the opposition to, or the control or overthrow of, the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unlawful means,

is deportable.''.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT OF INADMISSIBLE AND DEPORTABLE FOREIGN NATIONALS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State, in cooperation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, shall submit a report to the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that identifies—

(1) the nationality and visa admission category of each of the foreign nationals who was determined, during the reporting period, to be inadmissible under clause (ii) or (iii) of section 212(a)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by subsection (b)(1), or deportable pursuant to clause (ii) or (iii) of section 237(a)(4)(A) of such Act, as amended by subsection (b)(2); and

(2) the research institutions, private sector companies or other entities, United States Government agencies, and taxpayer-funded organizations with which such foreign nationals were associated.

SA 1999. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle C—Cyber and Technology Diplomacy

SEC. 4271. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021''.

SEC. 4272. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The stated goal of the United States International Strategy for Cyberspace, launched on May 16, 2011, is to ''work internationally to promote an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable information and communications infrastructure that supports international trade and commerce, strengthens international security, and fosters free expression and innovation ... in which norms of responsible behavior guide states' actions, sustain partnerships, and support the rule of law in cyberspace''.

(2) In its June 24, 2013, report, the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (referred to in this section as ''GGE''), established by the United Nations General Assembly, concluded that ''State sovereignty and the international norms and principles that flow from it apply to States' conduct of ICT-related activities and to their jurisdiction over ICT infrastructure with their territory''.

(3) In January 2015, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan proposed a troubling international code of conduct for information security, which could be used as a pretext for restricting political dissent, and includes ''curbing the dissemination of information that incites terrorism, separatism or extremism or that inflames hatred on ethnic, racial or religious grounds''.

(4) In its July 22, 2015, consensus report, GGE found that ''norms of responsible State behavior can reduce risks to international peace, security and stability''.

(5) On September 25, 2015, the United States and China announced a commitment that neither country's government ''will conduct or knowingly support cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to companies or commercial sectors''.

(6) At the Antalya Summit on November 15 and 16, 2015, the Group of 20 Leaders' communiqué—

(A) affirmed the applicability of international law to state behavior in cyberspace;

(B) called on states to refrain from cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property for commercial gain; and

(C) endorsed the view that all states should abide by norms of responsible behavior.

(7) The March 2016 Department of State International Cyberspace Policy Strategy noted that ''the Department of State anticipates a continued increase and expansion of our cyber-focused diplomatic efforts for the foreseeable future''.

(8) On December 1, 2016, the Commission on Enhancing National Cybersecurity, which was established within the Department of Commerce by Executive Order No. 13718 (81 Fed. Reg. 7441), recommended that ''the President should appoint an Ambassador for Cybersecurity to lead U.S. engagement with the international community on cybersecurity strategies, standards, and practices''.

(9) On April 11, 2017, the 2017 Group of 7 Declaration on Responsible States Behavior in Cyberspace—

(A) recognized ''the urgent necessity of increased international cooperation to promote security and stability in cyberspace'';

(B) expressed commitment to ''promoting a strategic framework for conflict prevention, cooperation and stability in cyberspace, consisting of the recognition of the applicability of existing international law to State behavior in cyberspace, the promotion of voluntary, non-binding norms of responsible State behavior during peacetime, and the development and the implementation of practical cyber confidence building measures (CBMs) between States''; and

(C) reaffirmed that ''the same rights that people have offline must also be protected online''.

(10) In testimony before the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate on May 11, 2017, Director of National Intelligence Daniel R. Coats identified 6 cyber threat actors, including—

(A) Russia, for ''efforts to influence the 2016 U.S. election'';

(B) China, for ''actively targeting the U.S. Government, its allies, and U.S. companies for cyber espionage'';

(C) Iran, for ''leverag[ing] cyber espionage, propaganda, and attacks to support its security priorities, influence events and foreign perceptions, and counter threats'';

(D) North Korea, for ''previously conduct[ing] cyber-attacks against U.S. commercial entities—specifically, Sony Pictures Entertainment in 2014'';

(E) terrorists, who ''use the Internet to organize, recruit, spread propaganda, raise funds, collect intelligence, inspire action by followers, and coordinate operations''; and

(F) criminals, who ''are also developing and using sophisticated cyber tools for a variety of purposes including theft, extortion, and facilitation of other criminal activities''.

(11) Information and communication technologies are among a broader set of critical and emerging technologies that underpin United States national security and economic prosperity. The 2017 National Security Strategy noted the central importance of ''emerging technologies . . . such as data science, encryption, autonomous technologies, gene editing, new materials, nanotechnology, advanced computing technologies, and artificial intelligence.''.

(12) The 21st century will increasingly be defined by economic and military competition rooted in technological advances. Leaders in adopting critical and emerging technologies, and those who shape the use of such technologies, will garner economic, military, and political strength for decades.

SEC. 4273. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''Executive agency'' has the meaning given such term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY; ICT.—The terms ''information and communications technology'' and ''ICT'' include hardware, software, and other products or services primarily intended to fulfill or enable the function of information processing and communication by electronic means, including transmission and display, including via the Internet.

SEC. 4274. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the policy of the United States to work internationally to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, unfettered, and secure Internet governed by the multi-stakeholder model, which—

(1) promotes human rights, democracy, and rule of law, including freedom of expression, innovation, communication, and economic prosperity; and

(2) respects privacy and guards against deception, fraud, and theft.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—In implementing the policy described in subsection (a), the President, in consultation with outside actors, including private sector companies, nongovernmental organizations, security researchers, and other relevant stakeholders, in the conduct of bilateral and multilateral relations, shall pursue the following objectives:

(1) Clarifying the applicability of international laws and norms to the use of ICT.

(2) Reducing and limiting the risk of escalation and retaliation in cyberspace, damage to critical infrastructure, and other malicious cyber activity that impairs the use and operation of critical infrastructure that provides services to the public.

(3) Cooperating with like-minded democratic countries that share common values and cyberspace policies with the United States, including respect for human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, to advance such values and policies internationally.

(4) Encouraging the responsible development of new, innovative technologies and ICT products that strengthen a secure Internet architecture that is accessible to all.

(5) Securing and implementing commitments on responsible country behavior in cyberspace based upon accepted norms, including the following:

(A) Countries should not conduct, or knowingly support, cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to companies or commercial sectors.

(B) Countries should take all appropriate and reasonable efforts to keep their territories clear of intentionally wrongful acts using ICTs in violation of international commitments.

(C) Countries should not conduct or knowingly support ICT activity that, contrary to international law, intentionally damages or otherwise impairs the use and operation of critical infrastructure providing services to the public, and should take appropriate measures to protect their critical infrastructure from ICT threats.

(D) Countries should not conduct or knowingly support malicious international activity that, contrary to international law, harms the information systems of authorized emergency response teams (also known as ''computer emergency response teams'' or ''cybersecurity incident response teams'') of another country or authorize emergency response teams to engage in malicious international activity.

(E) Countries should respond to appropriate requests for assistance to mitigate malicious ICT activity emanating from their territory and aimed at the critical infrastructure of another country.

(F) Countries should not restrict cross-border data flows or require local storage or processing of data.

(G) Countries should protect the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms on the Internet and commit to the principle that the human rights that people have offline should also be protected online.

(6) Advancing, encouraging, and supporting the development and adoption of internationally recognized technical standards and best practices.

SEC. 4275. DEPARTMENT OF STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall establish, within the Department of State, the Bureau of International Cyberspace Policy (referred to in this subsection as the 'Bureau'). The head of the Bureau shall have the rank and status of ambassador and shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(2) DUTIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Bureau shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of State shall prescribe, including implementing the policy of the United States described in section 4274 of the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021.

''(B) DUTIES DESCRIBED.—The principal duties and responsibilities of the head of the Bureau shall be—

''(i) to serve as the principal cyberspace policy official within the senior management of the Department of State and as the advisor to the Secretary of State for cyberspace issues;

''(ii) to lead the Department of State's diplomatic cyberspace efforts, including efforts relating to international cybersecurity, Internet access, Internet governance and online freedom, relevant elements of the digital economy, cybercrime, deterrence and international responses to cyber threats, and other issues that the Secretary assigns to the Bureau;

''(iii) to coordinate cyberspace policy and other relevant functions within the Department of State and with other components of the United States Government, including—

''(I) through the Cyberspace Policy Coordinating Committee described in paragraph (6); and

''(II) by convening other coordinating meetings with appropriate officials from the Department and other components of the United States Government on a regular basis;

''(iv) to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, and secure information and communications technology infrastructure globally;

''(v) to represent the Secretary of State in interagency efforts to develop and advance the policy described in section 4274 of the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021;

''(vi) to act as a liaison to civil society, the private sector, academia, and other public and private entities on relevant international cyberspace issues;

''(vii) to lead United States Government efforts to establish a global deterrence framework for malicious cyber activity;

''(viii) to develop and execute adversary-specific strategies to influence adversary decisionmaking through the imposition of costs and deterrence strategies, in coordination with other relevant Executive agencies;

''(ix) to advise the Secretary and coordinate with foreign governments on external responses to national security-level cyber incidents, including coordination on diplomatic response efforts to support allies threatened by malicious cyber activity, in conjunction with members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other like-minded countries;

''(x) to promote the adoption of national processes and programs that enable threat detection, prevention, and response to malicious cyber activity emanating from the territory of a foreign country, including as such activity relates to the United States' European allies, as appropriate;

''(xi) to promote the building of foreign capacity relating to cyberspace policy priorities;

''(xii) to promote the maintenance of an open and interoperable Internet governed by the multistakeholder model, instead of by centralized government control;

''(xiii) to promote an international regulatory environment for technology investments and the Internet that benefits United States economic and national security interests;

''(xiv) to promote cross-border flow of data and combat international initiatives seeking to impose unreasonable requirements on United States businesses;

''(xv) to promote international policies to protect the integrity of United States and international telecommunications infrastructure from foreign-based, cyber-enabled threats;

''(xvi) to lead engagement, in coordination with relevant Executive agencies, with foreign governments on relevant international cyberspace and digital economy issues described in the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021;

''(xvii) to promote international policies to secure radio frequency spectrum for United States businesses and national security needs;

''(xviii) to promote and protect the exercise of human rights, including freedom of speech and religion, through the Internet;

''(xix) to promote international initiatives to strengthen civilian and private sector resiliency to threats in cyberspace;

''(xx) to build capacity of United States diplomatic officials to engage on cyberspace issues;

''(xxi) to encourage the development and adoption by foreign countries of internationally recognized cyber standards, policies, and best practices;

''(xxii) to consult, as appropriate, with other Executive agencies with related functions vested in such Executive agencies by law; and

''(xxiii) to conduct such other matters as the Secretary of State may assign.

''(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—The head of the Bureau should be an individual of demonstrated competency in the fields of—

''(A) cybersecurity and other relevant cyberspace issues; and

''(B) international diplomacy.

''(4) ORGANIZATIONAL PLACEMENT.—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021, the head of the Bureau shall report to the Under Secretary for Political Affairs or

to an official holding a higher position in the Department of State than the Under Secretary for Political Affairs. After the conclusion of such period, the head of the Bureau may report to a different Under Secretary or to an official holding a higher position than Under Secretary if, not less than 15 days before any change in such reporting structure, the Secretary of State consults with and provides to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives—

''(A) a notification that the Secretary has, with respect to the reporting structure of the Bureau, consulted with and solicited feedback from—

''(i) other relevant Federal entities with a role in international aspects of cyber policy; and

''(ii) the elements of the Department of State with responsibility over aspects of cyber policy, including the elements reporting to—

''(I) the Under Secretary for Political Affairs;

''(II) the Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights;

''(III) the Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment;

''(IV) the Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security Affairs; and

''(V) the Under Secretary for Management;

''(B) a description of—

''(i) the new reporting structure for the head of the Bureau; and

''(ii) the data and evidence used to justify such new structure; and

''(C) a plan describing how the new reporting structure will better enable the head of the Bureau to carry out the responsibilities specified in paragraph (2), including the security, economic, and human rights aspects of cyber diplomacy.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to preclude the head of the Bureau from being designated as an Assistant Secretary, if such an Assistant Secretary position does not increase the number of Assistant Secretary positions at the Department above the number authorized under subsection (c)(1).

''(6) COORDINATION.—

''(A) CYBERSPACE POLICY COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—There is established a senior-level Cyberspace Policy Coordinating Committee to ensure that cyberspace issues receive broad senior level-attention and coordination across the Department of State and provide ongoing oversight of such issues. The Cyberspace Policy Coordinating Committee shall be chaired by the head of the Bureau or an official of the Department of State holding a higher position, and operate on an ongoing basis, meeting not less frequently than quarterly. Committee members shall include appropriate officials at the Assistant Secretary level or higher from—

''(i) the Under Secretariat for Political Affairs;

''(ii) the Under Secretariat for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights;

''(iii) the Under Secretariat for Economic Growth, Energy and the Environment;

''(iv) the Under Secretariat for Arms Control and International Security;

''(v) the Under Secretariat for Management; and

''(vi) other senior level Department participants, as appropriate.

''(B) OTHER MEETINGS.—The head of the Bureau shall convene other coordinating meetings with appropriate officials from the Department of State and other components of the United States Government to ensure regular coordination and collaboration on cross-cutting cyber policy issues.''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Bureau of International Cyberspace Policy established under section 1(g) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as added by subsection (a), should have a diverse workforce composed of qualified individuals, including such individuals from traditionally under-represented groups.

(c) UNITED NATIONS.—The Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations should use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any measure that is inconsistent with the policy described in section 4274.

(d) SPECIAL HIRING AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary of State may—

(1) appoint employees without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, regarding appointments in the competitive service; and

(2) fix the basic compensation of such employees without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title regarding classification and General Schedule pay rates.

SEC. 4276. BRIEFINGS ON INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) EXISTING EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding any executive bilateral or multilateral cyberspace arrangement in effect before such date of enactment, including—

(1) the arrangement announced between the United States and Japan on April 25, 2014;

(2) the arrangement announced between the United States and the United Kingdom on January 16, 2015;

(3) the arrangement announced between the United States and China on September 25, 2015;

(4) the arrangement announced between the United States and Korea on October 16, 2015;

(5) the arrangement announced between the United States and Australia on January 19, 2016;

(6) the arrangement announced between the United States and India on June 7, 2016;

(7) the arrangement announced between the United States and Argentina on April 27, 2017;

(8) the arrangement announced between the United States and Kenya on June 22, 2017;

(9) the arrangement announced between the United States and Israel on June 26, 2017;

(10) the arrangement announced between the United States and France on February 9, 2018;

(11) the arrangement announced between the United States and Brazil on May 14, 2018; and

(12) any other similar bilateral or multilateral arrangement announced before such date of enactment.

SEC. 4277. INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY FOR CYBERSPACE.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, and in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall develop a strategy relating to United States engagement with foreign governments on international norms with respect to responsible state behavior in cyberspace.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a review of actions and activities undertaken to support the policy described in section 4274;

(2) a plan of action to guide the diplomacy of the Department of State with regard to foreign countries, including—

(A) conducting bilateral and multilateral activities to—

(i) develop norms of responsible country behavior in cyberspace consistent with the objectives specified in section 4274(b)(5); and

(ii) share best practices and advance proposals to strengthen civilian and private sector resiliency to threats and access to opportunities in cyberspace; and

(B) reviewing the status of existing efforts in relevant multilateral fora, as appropriate, to obtain commitments on international norms in cyberspace;

(3) a review of alternative concepts with regard to international norms in cyberspace offered by foreign countries;

(4) a detailed description of new and evolving threats in cyberspace from foreign adversaries, state-sponsored actors, and private actors to—

(A) United States national security;

(B) Federal and private sector cyberspace infrastructure of the United States;

(C) intellectual property in the United States; and

(D) the privacy and security of citizens of the United States;

(5) a review of policy tools available to the President to deter and de-escalate tensions with foreign countries, state-sponsored actors, and private actors regarding threats in cyberspace, the degree to which such tools have been used, and whether such tools have been effective deterrents;

(6) a review of resources required to conduct activities to build responsible norms of international cyber behavior; and

(7) a plan of action, developed in consultation with relevant Federal departments and agencies as the President may direct, to guide the diplomacy of the Department of State with regard to inclusion of cyber issues in mutual defense agreements.

(c) FORM OF STRATEGY.—

(1) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be available to the public in unclassified form, including through publication in the Federal Register.

(2) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The strategy required under subsection (a) may include a classified annex, consistent with United States national security interests, if the Secretary of State determines that such annex is appropriate.

(d) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding the strategy, including any material contained in a classified annex.

(e) UPDATES.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be updated—

(1) not later than 90 days after any material change to United States policy described in such strategy; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the inauguration of each new President.

SEC. 4278. ANNUAL COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 116 (22 U.S.C. 2151n), by adding at the end the following:

''(h) FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION ASSESSMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The report required under subsection (d) shall include an assessment of freedom of expression with respect to electronic information in each foreign country, which shall include—

''(A)(i) an assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country inappropriately attempt to filter, censor, or otherwise block or remove nonviolent expression of political or religious opinion or belief through the Internet, including electronic mail; and

''(ii) a description of the means by which such authorities attempt to inappropriately block or remove such expression;

''(B) an assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country have persecuted or otherwise punished, arbitrarily and without due process, an individual or group for the nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief through the Internet, including electronic mail;

''(C) an assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country have sought, inappropriately and with malicious intent, to collect, request, obtain, or disclose without due process personally identifiable information of a person in connection with that person's nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief, including expression that would be protected by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted at New York December 16, 1966, and entered into force March 23, 1976, as interpreted by the United States; and

''(D) an assessment of the extent to which wire communications and electronic communications are monitored without due process and in contravention to United States policy with respect to the principles of privacy, human rights, democracy, and rule of law.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—In compiling data and making assessments under paragraph (1), United States diplomatic personnel should consult with relevant entities, including human rights organizations, the private sector, the governments of like-minded countries, technology and Internet companies, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations or entities.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'electronic communication' has the meaning given such term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) the term 'Internet' has the meaning given such term in section 231(e)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 231(e)(3));

''(C) the term 'personally identifiable information' means data in a form that identifies a particular person; and

''(D) the term 'wire communication' has the meaning given such term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.''; and

(2) in section 502B (22 U.S.C. 2304)—

(A) by redesignating the second subsection (i) (relating to child marriage) as subjection (j); and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(k) FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION ASSESSMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The report required under subsection (b) shall include an assessment of freedom of expression with respect to electronic information in each foreign country, which shall include—

''(A)(i) an assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country inappropriately attempt to filter, censor, or otherwise block or remove nonviolent expression of political or religious opinion or belief through the Internet, including electronic mail; and

''(ii) a description of the means by which such authorities attempt to inappropriately block or remove such expression;

''(B) an assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country have persecuted or otherwise punished, arbitrarily and without due process, an individual or group for the nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief through the Internet, including electronic mail;

''(C) an assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country have sought, inappropriately and with malicious intent, to collect, request, obtain, or disclose without due process personally identifiable information of a person in connection with that person's nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief, including expression that would be protected by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted at New York December 16, 1966, and entered into force March 23, 1976, as interpreted by the United States; and

''(D) an assessment of the extent to which wire communications and electronic communications are monitored without due process and in contravention to United States policy with respect to the principles of privacy, human rights, democracy, and rule of law.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—In compiling data and making assessments under paragraph (1), United States diplomatic personnel should consult with relevant entities, including human rights organizations, the private sector, the governments of like-minded countries, technology and Internet companies, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations or entities.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'electronic communication' has the meaning given the term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) the term 'Internet' has the meaning given the term in section 231(e)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 231(e)(3));

''(C) the term 'personally identifiable information' means data in a form that identifies a particular person; and

''(D) the term 'wire communication' has the meaning given the term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.''.

SEC. 4279. GAO REPORT ON CYBER AND TECHNOLOGY DIPLOMACY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report and provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an assessment of the extent to which United States diplomatic processes and other efforts with foreign countries, including through multilateral fora, bilateral engagements, and negotiated cyberspace agreements, advance the full range of United States interests in cyberspace, including the policy described in section 4274;

(2) an assessment of the extent to which United States diplomatic processes and other efforts with foreign countries, including through multilateral fora, bilateral engagements, and negotiated agreements, advance the full range of United States interests with respect to critical and emerging technologies;

(3) an assessment of the Department of State's organizational structure and its approach to managing its diplomatic efforts to advance the full range of United States interests in cyberspace and with respect to critical and emerging technologies, including a review of—

(A) the establishment of a bureau in the Department of State to lead the Department's international cyber mission;

(B) the current or proposed diplomatic mission, structure, staffing, funding, and activities of such bureau;

(C) how the establishment of such bureau has impacted or is likely to impact the structure and organization of the Department of State;

(D) what challenges, if any, the Department of State has faced or will face in establishing such bureau;

(E) the current and proposed diplomatic mission, structure, staffing, funding, and activities related to critical and emerging technologies; and

(F) how the Department of State is integrating the critical and emerging technologies mission with the cyber mission; and

(4) any other matters that the Comptroller General determines to be relevant.

SEC. 4280. STRATEGY FOR CRITICAL AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy for critical and emerging technologies that—

(1) identifies key international and diplomatic issues related to critical and emerging technologies;

(2) identifies the specific components of the Department of State accountable for the issues identified in paragraph (1);

(3) defines the processes by which the Department of State will identify, understand, and allocate responsibilities for novel technologies;

(4) defines the processes for reporting and information sharing within the Department of State;

(5) defines the processes for interagency consultation and collaboration;

(6) identifies how existing processes at the Department of State will be integrated into new efforts by the Department of State on critical and emerging technologies; and

(7) defines a strategy for recruiting training, and retaining additional personnel needed to implement the strategy, including individuals with significant expertise and training in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

SA 2000. Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. CERTIFICATION REQUIRED TO REMOVE ENTITIES FROM ENTITY LIST.

The Secretary of Commerce may not remove any entity from the entity list maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security and set forth in Supplement No. 4 to part 744 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, until the Secretary certifies to Congress that the entity is no longer reasonably believed to be involved in activities contrary to national security or foreign policy interests of the United States.

SA 2001. Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Ms. ERNST) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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. _____. VIRTUAL CURRENCIES AND THEIR GLOBAL USE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General, the United States Trade Representative, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and any other agencies or departments that the Secretary of the Treasury determines are necessary, shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on virtual currency and their global use, which shall—

(1) assess how foreign countries use and mine virtual currencies, including identifying the largest state and private industry users and miners of virtual currency, policies foreign countries have adopted to encourage virtual currency use and mining, and how foreign countries could be strengthened or undermined by the use and mining of cryptocurrencies within their borders;

(2) identify, to the greatest extent practicable, the types and dollar value of virtual currency mined for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2022 within the United States and globally, as well as within the People's Republic of China and within any other countries the Secretary of the Treasury determines are relevant; and

(3) identify vulnerabilities, including those related to supply disruptions and technology availability of the global microelectronic supply chain, and opportunities with respect to virtual currency mining operations.

(b) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SA 2002. Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I of division F, add the following:

Subtitle D—Teach CS Act

SEC. 6131. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Teacher Education for Computer Science Act'' or the ''Teach CS Act''.

SEC. 6132. TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT.

Section 204(a)(4)(G)(i) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1022c(a)(4)(G)(i)) is amended by inserting ''and development of computational thinking skills'' after ''integrate technology''.

SEC. 6133. ENHANCING TEACHER EDUCATION.

Section 232(c)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1032a(c)(2)) is amended by inserting ''and development of computational thinking skills,'' after ''technology''.

SEC. 6134. TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR COMPUTER SCIENCE EDUCATION.

Part B of title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended (20 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.) by adding at the end the following:

''Subpart 6—Teacher Education Programs for Computer Science Education

''SEC. 259. TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR COMPUTER SCIENCE EDUCATION.

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—From the amounts appropriated to carry out this section, the Secretary may award competitive grants to eligible institutions to establish centers of excellence in teacher education programs to support computer science education and computational thinking skill development.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A grant awarded to an eligible institution under this section—

''(1) shall be used by such institution to ensure that current and future teachers meet the applicable State certification and licensure requirements in a field that will enable them to teach computer science in their State at the elementary and secondary school levels, by—

''(A) creating teacher education programs that meet the requirements of section 200(6)(A)(iv) and offer, through hands-on and classroom teaching activities with in-service teachers—

''(i) doctoral, master's, or bachelor's degrees in teaching computer science at the elementary school and secondary school levels; or

''(ii) teaching endorsements in computer science, in the case of a teacher with related State certification and licensure requirements or a student who is pursuing certification and licensure requirements in related fields, such as mathematics and science;

''(B) ensuring that current and future teachers who graduate from such programs meet the applicable State certification and licensure requirements, including any requirements for certification obtained through alternative routes to certification, or, with regard to special education teachers, the qualifications described in section 612(a)(14)(C) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

''(C) recruiting individuals to enroll in such programs, including subject matter experts and professionals in fields related to computer science; and

''(D) awarding scholarships and fellowships of not more than $4,000 per student based on financial need and to recruit traditionally underrepresented groups in computer science to help such students pay the cost of attendance (as defined in section 472); and

''(2) may be used by such institution to conduct research in computer science education and computational thinking skills to improve instruction in such areas.

''(c) DURATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall be awarded for 5 years, conditional upon a satisfactory report to the Secretary of progress with respect to the program carried out with the grant after the first 3 years of the grant period.

''(2) REPORT OF PROGRESS.—Such report of progress on the program shall include data on the number of students and instructors enrolled, information on former graduates (including on how many earn teaching certification or licensure in a field that will enable them to teach computer science in their State at the secondary level, be prepared to teach computer science at the elementary level, and support students in developing computational thinking skills), and data on any additional funding (other than Federal funds) received to carry out the program.

''(d) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible institution desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary, at such time in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, which shall include—

''(A) a demonstration of the need for teachers with the certification or licensure requirements that enable them to teach computer science at the elementary and secondary level in the geographic area or State in which the institution is located;

''(B) the plan to ensure the longevity of the program after the end of the grant; and

''(C) the plan to scale up the program (including the plan for the number of personnel to be hired, a description of their expected qualifications and titles, the number of fellowships and scholarships to be awarded, the estimated administrative expenses, proposed academic advising strategy, and organizing and outreach to maintain virtual community of computer science educators).

''(2) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall award grants under this section in a manner that ensures an equitable distribution of grants—

''(A) to rural and urban eligible institutions;

''(B) to eligible institutions that qualify for a waiver under subsection (e)(2); and

''(C) to eligible institutions that are located in areas where there is a need for increasing computer science education opportunities.

''(e) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall provide, from non-Federal sources, an amount that is not less than 50 percent of the amount of the grant, which may be provided in cash or in-kind, to carry out the activities supported by the grant.

''(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary shall waive all or part of the matching requirement described in paragraph (1) for any fiscal year the Secretary determines that applying such requirement to the eligible institution would result in serious hardship or an inability to carry out the authorized activities described in this section.

''(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the first grant is awarded under his section and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the success of the program based on metrics determined by the Secretary, including the number of centers established, the number of enrolled students, and the number of qualified teachers.

''(g) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall use up to 5 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year to provide technical assistance to eligible institutions.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term 'eligible institution' means an institution of higher education, as defined in section 101, which may be in a partnership with a nonprofit organization.

''(2) COMPUTER SCIENCE.—The term 'computer science' means the study of computers, including algorithmic processes and the study of computing principles and theories, as defined by a State, and may include instruction or learning on—

''(A) computer programming or coding as a tool to—

''(i) create software, such as applications, games, and websites; and

''(ii) process, manage, analyze, or manipulate data;

''(B) development and management of computer hardware related to sharing, processing, representing, securing, and using digital information; and

''(C) computational thinking skills and interdisciplinary problem-solving to equip

students with the skills and abilities necessary to apply computational thinking in the digital world.

''(3) COMPUTATIONAL THINKING.—The term 'computational thinking' means critical thinking skills that—

''(A) include knowledge of how problems and solutions can be expressed in such a way that allows them to be modeled or solved using a computer or machine;

''(B) include the use of strategies related to problem decomposition, pattern matching, abstractions, modularity, and algorithm design; and

''(C) involve creative problem solving skills and are applicable across a wide range of disciplines and careers.''.

SA 2003. Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. TILLIS) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR GAIN-OF-FUNCTION RESEARCH CONDUCTED IN CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No funds made available to any Federal agency, including the National Institutes of Health, may be used to conduct gain-of-function research in China.

(b) DEFINITION OF GAIN-OF-FUNCTION RESEARCH.—In this section, the term ''gain-of-function research'' means any research project that may be reasonably anticipated to confer attributes to influenza, MERS, or SARS viruses such that the virus would have enhanced pathogenicity or transmissibility in mammals.

SA 2004. Mr. SASSE (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PLAN FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DIGITAL ECOSYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall—

(1) develop a plan for the development and resourcing of a modern digital ecosystem that embraces state-of-the-art tools and modern processes to enable development, testing, fielding, and continuous update of artificial intelligence-powered applications at speed and scale from headquarters to the tactical edge; and

(2) submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives the plan developed under paragraph (1).

(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—At a minimum, the plan required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A roadmap for adopting a hoteling model to allow trusted small- and medium-sized artificial intelligence companies access to classified facilities on a flexible basis.

(2) An open architecture and an evolving reference design and guidance for needed technical investments in the proposed ecosystem that address issues, including common interfaces, authentication, applications, platforms, software, hardware, and data infrastructure.

(3) A governance structure, together with associated policies and guidance, to drive the implementation of the reference throughout the intelligence community on a federated basis.

(c) FORM.—The plan submitted under subsection (a)(2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 2005. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. LUJÁN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V of division B, add the following:

SEC. _____. STUDY ON NATIONAL LABORATORY CONSORTIUM FOR CYBER RESILIENCE.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Energy shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense, conduct a study to analyze the feasibility of authorizing a consortia within the National Laboratory system to address information technology and operational technology cybersecurity vulnerabilities in critical infrastructure (as defined in section 1016(e) of the Critical Infrastructures Protection Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e)).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of any additional authorities needed to establish a research and development program to leverage the expertise at the Department of Energy National Laboratories to accelerate development and delivery of advanced tools and techniques to defend critical infrastructure against cyber intrusions and enable resilient operations during a cyber attack.

(2) Evaluation of potential pilot programs in research, innovation transfer, academic partnerships, and industry partnerships for critical infrastructure protection research.

(3) Identification of and assessment of near-term actions, and cost estimates, necessary for the proposed consortia to be established and effective at a broad scale expeditiously.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) FORM.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 2006. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REASONABLE, NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS PLATFORMS; BLOCKING AND SCREENING OF OFFENSIVE MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of title II of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 230; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 232. REASONABLE, NON-DISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS PLATFORMS; BLOCKING AND SCREENING OF OFFENSIVE MATERIAL.

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

''(1) The rapidly developing array of internet and other interactive computer services available to individual Americans represent an extraordinary advance in the availability of educational and informational resources to our citizens.

''(2) These services often offer users a great degree of control over the information that they receive, as well as the potential for even greater control in the future as technology continues to develop.

''(3) The internet and other interactive computer services offer a forum for a true diversity of political discourse and viewpoints, unique opportunities for cultural development, and myriad avenues for intellectual activity, and regulation of the internet must be tailored to supporting those activities.

''(4) The internet and other interactive computer services have flourished, to the benefit of all Americans, with a minimum of government regulation, and regulation should be limited to what is necessary to preserve the societal benefits provided by the internet.

''(5) Increasingly Americans rely on internet platforms and websites for a variety of political, educational, cultural, and entertainment services and for communication with one another.

''(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

''(1) to promote the continued development of the internet and other interactive computer services and other interactive media;

''(2) to preserve a vibrant and competitive free market for the internet and other interactive computer services;

''(3) to encourage the development of technologies which maximize user control over what information is received by individuals, families, and schools who use the internet and other interactive computer services, rather than control and censorship driven by interactive computer services;

''(4) to facilitate the development and utilization of blocking and filtering technologies that empower parents to restrict their children's access to objectionable or inappropriate online material;

''(5)(A) to ensure that the internet serves as an open forum for—

''(i) a true diversity of discourse and viewpoints, including political discourse and viewpoints;

''(ii) unique opportunities for cultural development; and

''(iii) myriad avenues for intellectual activity; and

''(B) given that the internet is the dominant platform for communication and public debate today, to ensure that major internet communications platforms, which function as common carriers in terms of their size, usage, and necessity, are available to all users on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms free from public or private censorship of religious and political speech;

''(6) to promote consumer protection and transparency regarding information and content management practices by major internet platforms to—

''(A) ensure that consumers understand—

''(i) the products they are using; and

''(ii) what information is being presented to them and why; and

''(B) prevent deceptive or undetectable actions that filter the information presented to consumers; and

''(7) to ensure vigorous enforcement of Federal criminal laws to deter and punish trafficking in online obscenity, stalking, and harassment.

''(c) REASONABLE AND NONDISCRIMINATORY ACCESS TO COMMON CARRIER TECHNOLOGY COMPANIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A common carrier technology company, with respect to the interactive computer service provided by the company—

''(A) shall furnish the interactive computer service to all persons upon reasonable request;

''(B) may not unjustly or unreasonably discriminate in charges, practices, classifications, regulations, facilities, treatment, or services for or in connection with the furnishing of the interactive computer service, directly or indirectly, by any means or device;

''(C) may not make or give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, class of persons, political or religious group or affiliation, or locality; and

''(D) may not subject any particular person, class of persons, political or religious group or affiliation, or locality to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage.

''(2) APPLICABILITY TO BROADBAND.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the provision of broadband internet access service.

''(d) CONSUMER PROTECTION AND TRANSPARENCY REGARDING COMMON CARRIER TECHNOLOGY COMPANIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A common carrier technology company shall disclose, through a publicly available, easily accessible website, accurate material regarding the content management, moderation, promotion, account termination and suspension, and curation mechanisms and practices of the company sufficient to enable—

''(A) consumers to make informed choices regarding use of the interactive computer service provided by the company; and

''(B) persons to develop, market, and maintain consumer-driven content management mechanisms with respect to the interactive computer service provided by the company.

''(2) BEST PRACTICES.—The Commission, after soliciting comments from the public, shall publish best practices for common carrier technology companies to disclose content management, moderation, promotion, account termination and suspension, and curation mechanisms and practices in accordance with paragraph (1).

''(3) APPLICABILITY TO BROADBAND.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the provision of broadband internet access service.

''(e) PROTECTION FOR 'GOOD SAMARITAN' BLOCKING AND SCREENING OF OFFENSIVE MATERIAL.—

''(1) TREATMENT OF PUBLISHER OR SPEAKER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any material provided by another information content provider.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any affirmative act by a provider or user of an interactive computer service with respect to material posted on the interactive computer service, whether the act is carried out manually or through use of an algorithm or other automated or semi-automated process, including—

''(i) providing its own material;

''(ii) commenting or editorializing on, promoting, recommending, or increasing or decreasing the dissemination or visibility to users of its own material or material provided by another information content provider;

''(iii) restricting access to or availability of material provided by another information content provider; or

''(iv) barring or limiting any information content provider from using the interactive computer service.

''(2) CIVIL LIABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be held liable, under subsection (c) or otherwise, on account of—

''(i) any action voluntarily taken in good faith to restrict access to or availability of material that the provider or user considers to be obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, excessively violent, harassing, promoting self-harm, or unlawful, whether or not such material is constitutionally protected; or

''(ii) any action taken to enable or make available to information content providers or others the technical means to restrict access to material described in clause (i).

''(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

''(i) the term 'excessively violent', with respect to material, means material that—

''(I) is likely to be deemed violent and for mature audiences according to the V-chip regulations and TV Parental Guidelines of the Commission promulgated under sections 303(x) and 330(c)(4); or

''(II) constitutes or intends to advocate domestic terrorism or international terrorism, as defined in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code;

''(ii) the term 'harassing' means material that—

''(I) is—

''(aa) provided by an information content provider with the intent to abuse, threaten, or harass any specific person; and

''(bb) lacking in any serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value;

''(II) violates the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 (15 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); or

''(III) is malicious computer code intended (whether or not by the immediate disseminator) to damage or interfere with the operation of a computer;

''(iii) the term 'in good faith', with respect to restricting access to or availability of specific material, means the provider or user—

''(I) restricts access to or availability of material consistent with publicly available online terms of service or use that—

''(aa) state plainly and with particularity the criteria that the provider or user of the interactive computer service employs in its content moderation practices, including by any partially or fully automated processes; and

''(bb) are in effect on the date on which the material is first posted;

''(II) has an objectively reasonable belief that the material falls within one of the categories listed in subparagraph (A)(i);

''(III)(aa) does not restrict access to or availability of material on deceptive or pretextual grounds; and

''(bb) does not apply its terms of service or use to restrict access to or availability of material that is similarly situated to material that the provider or user of the interactive computer service intentionally declines to restrict; and

''(IV) supplies the information content provider of the material with timely notice describing with particularity the reasonable factual basis for the restriction of access and a meaningful opportunity to respond, unless the provider or user of the interactive computer service has an objectively reasonable belief that—

''(aa) the material is related to terrorism or criminal activity; or

''(bb) such notice would risk imminent physical harm to others; and

''(iv) the terms 'obscene', 'lewd', 'lascivious', and 'filthy', with respect to material, mean material that—

''(I) taken as a whole—

''(aa) appeals to the prurient interest in sex or portrays sexual conduct in a patently offensive way; and

''(bb) does not have serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value;

''(II) depicts or describes sexual or excretory organs or activities in terms patently offensive to the average person, applying contemporary community standards; or

''(III) signifies the form of immorality which has relation to sexual impurity, taking into account the standards at common law in prosecutions for obscene libel.

''(C) BEST PRACTICES.—The Commission, after soliciting comments from the public, shall publish best practices for making publicly available online terms of service or use that state plainly and with particularity the criteria that the provider or user of an interactive computer service employs in its content moderation practices, including by any partially or fully automated processes, in accordance with subparagraph (B)(iii)(I).

''(f) VIOLATIONS.—

''(1) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A person aggrieved by a violation of subsection (c) or (d) may bring a civil action against the provider or user of an interactive computer service that committed the violation for any relief permitted under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

''(B) RELIEF.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The plaintiff may seek the following relief in a civil action brought under subparagraph (A):

''(I) An injunction.

''(II) An award that is the greater of—

''(aa) actual damages; or

''(bb) damages in the amount of $500 for each violation.

''(ii) WILLFUL OR KNOWING VIOLATIONS.—In a civil action brought under subparagraph (A), if the court finds that the defendant willfully or knowingly violated subsection (c) or (d), the court may, in its discretion, increase the amount of the award to not more than 3 times the amount available under clause (i)(II) of this subparagraph.

''(2) ACTIONS BY STATES.—

''(A) AUTHORITY OF STATES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the attorney general of a State, or an official or agency designated by a State, has reason to believe that any person has engaged or is engaging in a pattern or practice of violating subsection (c) or (d) that has threatened or adversely affected or is threatening or adversely affecting an interest of the residents of that State, the State may bring a civil action against the person on behalf of the residents of the State for any relief permitted under clause (ii) of this subparagraph.

''(ii) RELIEF.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The plaintiff may seek the following relief in a civil action brought under clause (i):

''(aa) An injunction.

''(bb) An award that is the greater of—

''(AA) actual damages; or

''(BB) damages in the amount of $500 for each violation.

''(II) WILLFUL OR KNOWING VIOLATIONS.—In a civil action brought under clause (i), if the court finds that the defendant willfully or knowingly violated subsection (c) or (d), the court may, in its discretion, increase the amount of the award to not more than 3 times the amount available under subclause (I)(bb) of this clause.

''(B) INVESTIGATORY POWERS.—For purposes of bringing a civil action under this paragraph, nothing in this section shall prevent the attorney general of a State, or an official or agency designated by a State, from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general or the official by the laws of the State to—

''(i) conduct investigations;

''(ii) administer oaths or affirmations; or

''(iii) compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

''(C) EFFECT ON STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit an authorized State official from proceeding in State court on the basis of an alleged violation of any general civil or criminal statute of the State.

''(D) ATTORNEY GENERAL DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'attorney general' means the chief legal officer of a State.

''(3) VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

''(A) VENUE.—A civil action brought under this subsection may be brought in the location where—

''(i) the defendant—

''(I) is found;

''(II) is an inhabitant; or

''(III) transacts business; or

''(ii) the violation occurred or is occurring.

''(B) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—Process in a civil action brought under this subsection may be served where the defendant—

''(i) is an inhabitant; or

''(ii) may be found.

''(g) OBLIGATIONS OF INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE.—A provider of an interactive computer service shall, at the time of entering an agreement with a customer for the provision of interactive computer service and in a manner deemed appropriate by the provider, notify the customer that parental control protections (such as computer hardware, software, or filtering services) are commercially available that may assist the customer in limiting access to material that is harmful to minors. The notice shall identify, or provide the customer with access to material identifying, current providers of such protections.

''(h) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—

''(1) NO EFFECT ON CRIMINAL LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to impair the enforcement of section 223 or 231 of this Act, chapter 71 (relating to obscenity) or 110 (relating to sexual exploitation of children) of title 18, United States Code, or any other Federal criminal statute.

''(2) NO EFFECT ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or expand any law pertaining to intellectual property.

''(3) STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent any State from enforcing any State law that is consistent with this section. No cause of action may be brought and no liability may be imposed under any State or local law that is inconsistent with this section.

''(4) NO EFFECT ON COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the application of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986 or any of the amendments made by such Act, or any similar State law.

''(5) NO EFFECT ON SEX TRAFFICKING LAW.—Nothing in this section (other than subsection (e)(2)(A)(i) shall be construed to impair or limit—

''(A) any claim in a civil action brought under section 1595 of title 18, United States Code, if the conduct underlying the claim constitutes a violation of section 1591 of that title;

''(B) any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law if the conduct underlying the charge would constitute a violation of section 1591 of title 18, United States Code; or

''(C) any charge in a criminal prosecution brought under State law if the conduct underlying the charge would constitute a violation of section 2421A of title 18, United States Code, and promotion or facilitation of prostitution is illegal in the jurisdiction where the defendant's promotion or facilitation of prostitution was targeted.

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

''(1) ACCESS SOFTWARE PROVIDER.—The term 'access software provider' means a provider of software (including client or server software), or enabling tools that do any one or more of the following:

''(A) Filter, screen, allow, or disallow material.

''(B) Pick, choose, analyze, or digest material.

''(C) Transmit, receive, display, forward, cache, search, subset, organize, reorganize, or translate material.

''(2) BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.—The term 'broadband internet access service' has the meaning given the term in section 8.1(b) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

''(3) COMMON CARRIER TECHNOLOGY COMPANY.—The term 'common carrier technology company' means a provider of an interactive computer service that—

''(A) offers its services to the public; and

''(B) has more than 100,000,000 worldwide active monthly users.

''(4) INFORMATION CONTENT PROVIDER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'information content provider' means any person or entity that is responsible, in whole or in part, for the creation or development of material provided through the internet or any other interactive computer service.

''(B) RESPONSIBILITY DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'responsible, in whole or in part, for the creation or development of material' includes affirmatively and substantively contributing to, modifying, altering, presenting with a reasonably discernible viewpoint, commenting upon, or editorializing about material provided by another person or entity.

''(5) INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE.—The term 'interactive computer service' means any information service, system, or access software provider that provides or enables computer access by multiple users to a computer server, including specifically a service or system that provides access to the internet and such systems operated or services offered by libraries or educational institutions.

''(6) INTERNET.—The term 'internet' means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet switched data networks.

''(7) MATERIAL.—The term 'material' means any data, regardless of physical form or characteristic, including—

''(A) written or printed matter, information, automated information systems storage media, maps, charts, paintings, drawings, films, photographs, images, videos, engravings, sketches, working notes, or papers, or reproductions of any such things by any means or process; and

''(B) sound, voice, magnetic, or electronic recordings.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.—The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 223(h)(2) (47 U.S.C. 223(h)(2)), by striking ''section 230(f)(2)'' and inserting ''section 232''; and

(B) in section 231(b)(4) (47 U.S.C. 231(b)(4)), by striking ''section 230'' and inserting ''section 232''.

(2) TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.—Section 45 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'', approved July 5, 1946 (commonly known as the ''Trademark Act of 1946'') (15 U.S.C. 1127) is amended by striking the definition relating to the term ''Internet'' and inserting the following:

''The term 'internet' has the meaning given that term in section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934.''.

(3) TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1401(g) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230)'' and inserting ''section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934''; and

(B) by striking ''subsection (e)(2) of such section 230'' and inserting ''subsection (h)(2) of such section 232''.

(4) TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 2257(h)(2)(B)(v), by striking ''section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(c))'' and inserting ''section 232(e) of the Communications Act of 1934''; and

(B) in section 2421A—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking ''(as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))'' and inserting ''(as that term is defined in section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934)''; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking ''(as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))'' and inserting ''(as that term is defined in section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934)''.

(5) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.—Section 401(h)(3)(A)(iii)(II) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(h)(3)(A)(iii)(II)) is amended by striking ''section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934'' and inserting ''section 232(e) of the Communications Act of 1934''.

(6) WEBB-KENYON ACT.—Section 3(b)(1) of the Act entitled ''An Act divesting intoxicating liquors of their interstate character in certain cases'', approved March 1, 1913 (commonly known as the ''Webb-Kenyon Act'') (27 U.S.C. 122b(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''(as defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f))'' and inserting ''(as defined in section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934)''.

(7) TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 4102 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking ''section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230)'' and inserting ''section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 230 if'' and inserting ''that section if''; and

(B) in subsection (e)(2), by striking ''section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230)'' and inserting ''section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934''.

(8) TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 5362(6) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f))'' and inserting ''section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934''.

(9) NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATION ACT.—Section 157(e)(1) of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 941(e)(1)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(c))'' and inserting ''section 232(e) of the Communications Act of 1934''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Subsections (c) and (d) of section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to a common carrier technology company on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2007. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE _____—PROTECT ELECTORAL COLLEGE ACT

SEC. ___01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Protecting the Right to Organized, Transparent Elections through a Constitutionally Trustworthy Electoral College Act (PROTECT Electoral College Act)''.

SEC. ___02. REPORT ON 2020 GENERAL ELECTION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) 2016 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.—The term ''2016 Presidential election'' means the general election for Federal office occurring in 2016.

(2) 2020 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.—The term ''2020 Presidential election'' means the general election for Federal office occurring in 2020.

(3) APPLICABLE ELECTION SECURITY FUNDS.—The term ''applicable election security funds'' means the amount of grant funding provided to the State by the Election Assistance Commission—

(A) from amounts appropriated under the heading ''Election Assistance Commission, Election Security Grants'' in the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116–93); or

(B) from amounts appropriated under the heading ''Election Assistance Commission, Election Security Grants'' in the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116–136).

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the meaning given such term under section 901 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21141), except that such term shall include the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(5) UNSOLICITED MAIL-IN BALLOT.—The term ''unsolicited mail-in ballot'' means any ballot sent to a voter by mail if—

(A) such ballot was not specifically requested by the voter; or

(B) the ballot request by the voter was initiated by the mailing of a ballot application not specifically requested by the voter.

(6) UNSOLICITED MAIL-IN BALLOT PERCENTAGE.—The term ''unsolicited mail-in ballot percentage'' means the number of unsolicited mail-in ballots distributed in the State as a percentage of the number of total ballots provided to voters in the State.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a report on the 2020 Presidential election.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following with respect to each State: that received applicable election security funds:

(A) UNSOLICITED MAIL-IN BALLOT PERCENTAGE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An analysis of whether the unsolicited mail-in ballot percentage for State for the 2020 Presidential election was greater than the unsolicited mail-in ballot percentage for the State for the 2016 Presidential election.

(ii) RELEVANT AUTHORITY FOR ANY INCREASE.—If the Comptroller General determines that the unsolicited mail-in ballot percentage for the State for the 2020 Presidential election was greater than the unsolicited mail-in ballot percentage for the State for the 2016 Presidential election, the Comptroller General shall provide a description of any change in authority (including any statutory change relating to the distribution of unsolicited mail-in ballots), action, or directive concerning unsolicited mail-in ballots occurring between the 2016 Presidential election and 2020 Presidential election that may have led to such result.

(B) MAIL-IN VOTER VERIFICATION PROCEDURES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An analysis of whether there were changes in the State's methods and processes used to verify the identification of voters who vote using mail-in ballots, including signature verification requirements, that applied with respect to the 2020 Presidential election but did not apply to the 2016 Presidential election.

(ii) RELEVANT AUTHORITY FOR CHANGES.—If the Comptroller General determines that there were changes in the State's mail-in voter verification procedures described in clause (i), the Comptroller General shall provide a description of any authority (including any statutory authority), action, or directive that led to such change.

(C) OTHER ELECTION PROCEDURES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An analysis of whether the State materially altered or changed its election procedures for the 2020 Presidential election (other than procedures described in subparagraph (B)) from the procedures in effect for the 2016 Presidential election.

(ii) RELEVANT AUTHORITY FOR CHANGES.—If the Comptroller General determines that there were changes in the election procedures described in clause (i), the Comptroller General shall provide a description of any authority (including any statutory authority), action, or directive that led to such change.

(D) MAIL-IN BALLOT COLLECTION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An analysis of whether there were specific, documented allegations of a person other than a voter or a voter's family member or caregiver collecting or returning the voter's completed ballot in the 2020 Presidential election.

(ii) RELEVANT AUTHORITY FOR COLLECTION.—If the Comptroller General determines that there were specific, documented allegations described in clause (i), the Comptroller General shall provide a description of any authority (including any statutory authority), action, or directive permitting such collection or return.

(E) OBSERVATION OF BALLOT COUNTING.—An analysis of whether the State has a statute providing for third-party observation of ballot counting, and if so, whether there were specific, documented instances in connection with the 2020 Presidential election in which the State is alleged to have failed to comply with such statute.

(F) FAILURE TO ENFORCE.—An analysis of whether there were specific, documented instances in connection with the 2020 Presidential election in which the State allegedly failed to enforce one or more of its election statutes (other than a statute described in subparagraph (E)).

(G) USE OF APPLICABLE ELECTION SECURITY FUNDS.—In the case of a State that received applicable election security funds, an analysis of—

(i) whether such funds were used to make expenditures with respect to the 2020 Presidential election;

(ii) whether such funds were used in connection with any activity carried out pursuant to an authority, action, or directive described in subparagraph (A)(ii), (B)(ii), (C)(ii), or (D)(ii); and

(iii) whether the State complied with all statutory and other conditions imposed in connection with the receipt of such funds.

(H) SUBSEQUENT STATE ACTIONS.—A description of any of the following actions taken by the State legislature:

(i) The passage of a resolution expressing an opinion on, or the submission to Congress or the Comptroller General of a communication relating to, the items described in subparagraphs (A) through (G).

(ii) The enactment, after the completion of the 2020 Presidential election, of legislation regarding any authority, action, or directive described in subparagraph (A)(ii), (B)(ii), (C)(ii), or (D)(ii) or any failure described in subparagraph (E) or (F).

SEC. ___03. TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF, AND REQUIREMENTS FOR, FUTURE ELECTION ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART 7—REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTION ASSISTANCE

''SEC. 297. SUSPENSION OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no grant may be awarded under this Act before July 1, 2022.

''(b) SUSPENSION OF PREVIOUS GRANTS.—No State may expend Federal funds provided under this Act before the date of the enactment of this section before July 1, 2022.

''SEC. 298. REQUIREMENTS FOR FUTURE ELECTION ASSISTANCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no State may receive any grant awarded under this Act after the date of the enactment of this section unless the State has certified by resolution adopted by the State legislature, as a condition of receiving the grant, that it is in compliance with the requirements of subsection (b).

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State satisfies the requirements of this section if, in connection with any election for Federal office—

''(A) the methods and processes used by the State to verify the identification of voters who vote using mail-in ballots are specifically set forth in statute;

''(B) except as specifically provided by statute—

''(i) the State does not use unsolicited mail-in balloting; and

''(ii) the State does not permit persons other than the voter or the voter's family members or caregivers to return a voter's completed ballot;

''(C) for any election after the last day that the public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d) on January 31, 2020, with respect to COVID–19, is in effect, the State uses all voting procedures in place as of January 1, 2020 (except as modified by State statutes applying to elections after such date);

''(D) in the case of State that has a law providing for third-party observation of ballot counting, such ballot observation law is strictly followed in all instances;

''(E) the State complies with all requirements under title III; and

''(F) the State has taken documented, affirmative measures to address—

''(i) any prior failure to satisfy the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (E) that is identified by the State legislature in a resolution (or other similar communication submitted to Congress and the Comptroller General); or

''(ii) any prior specific, documented instance in which the State—

''(I) failed to enforce one or more of its election statutes; or

''(II) materially altered or changed its election procedures without a corresponding state statutory enactment.

''(2) UNSOLICITED MAIL-IN BALLOTING.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), the term 'unsolicited mail-in balloting' means the process of sending ballots to a voter by mail if—

''(A) such ballot was not specifically requested by the voter; or

''(B) the ballot request by the voter was initiated by the mailing of a ballot application not specifically requested by the voter.

''PART 8—PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS

''SEC. 299. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.

''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts provided under this Act shall not be used in furtherance of any election procedure that is not expressly set forth in a statute enacted by the State legislature.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 296 the following:

''PART 7—REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTION ASSISTANCE

''Sec. 297. Suspension of election assistance.

''Sec. 298. Requirements for future election assistance.

''PART 8—PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS

''Sec. 299. Prohibition on use of funds.''.

SA 2008. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 3236. EMERGENCY RESUPPLY FOR IRON DOME.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Emergency Resupply for IRON DOME Act of 2021''.

(b) FUNDING FOR IRON DOME SHORT-RANGE ROCKET DEFENSE SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 1649 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116–283) and sections 482(b) and 531(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291a(b) and 2346(e)), the President shall transfer all unexpended balances of appropriations made available for assistance to Gaza—

(1) to the Department of Defense, to be available for grants to Israel for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system; or

(2) to the Foreign Military Financing Program authorized under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763), to be available for grants to Israel for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

SA 2009. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROTECTING AMERICANS AGAINST FENTANYL AND OTHER SYNTHETIC OPIOIDS.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that all cabinet officials and other Government officers shall, in advancing American interests by working with other countries and international organizations, advocate for treating fentanyl and other synthetic opioids as weapons of mass destruction.

(b) HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.—Section 1921 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 591g) is amended by inserting ''fentanyl or synthetic opioid,'' after ''chemical,''.

(c) DEFENSE AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION ACT OF 1996.—Section 1403(1) of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 2302(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, or synthetic opioids.''.

(d) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.—Section 101(p)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(p)(2)) is amended by inserting '', including illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, or synthetic opioids'' after ''precursors''.

SA 2010. Mr. HAGERTY 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. _____. REPORT ON USE OF DRUG DETECTION TECHNOLOGY AT THE BORDER.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to Congress that describes—

(1) the technology that has been authorized by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to detect drug contraband entering the United States at or between ports of entry;

(2) the resources Congress has provided in furtherance of the technology described in paragraph (1);

(3) the technology that has been utilized at the United States border to detect drug contraband entering the United States at or between ports of entry; and

(4) the resources that the Department of Homeland Security has expended in furtherance of such technology.

SA 2011. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 3291I(c), strike ''a written report'' and all that follows through ''detailing a description'' and insert the following: ''an unclassified written report, with a classified annex, that includes—

(1) a description

In section 3291I, amend subsection (e) to read as follows:

(e) REPORT ON DRUG SEIZURES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, in coordination with the Office of National Drug Control Policy, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, the Coast Guard, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency , the Department of Defense, the United States Postal Service, and other relevant agencies, shall submit a report to Congress that describes—

(1) with respect to illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, synthetic opioids, the precursors for illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, or synthetic opioids, methamphetamine, or methamphetamine precursors seized at the United States borders and ports of entry—

(A) the source countries from which such drugs originated and the third party countries through which such drugs traveled;

(B) the amounts of illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, synthetic opioids, the precursors for illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, or synthetic opioids, methamphetamine, or methamphetamine precursors; and

(C) the lethality of the amounts of illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, synthetic opioids, the precursors for illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, or synthetic opioids, methamphetamine, or methamphetamine precursors seized;

(2) with respect to illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, synthetic opioids, the precursors for illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, or synthetic opioids, methamphetamine, or methamphetamine precursors seized within the United States—

(A) the source countries from which such drugs originated and the third party countries through which such drugs traveled;

(B) the amounts of illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, synthetic opioids, the precursors for illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, or synthetic opioids, methamphetamine, or methamphetamine precursors seized; and

(C) the lethality of the amounts of illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, synthetic opioids, the precursors for illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, or synthetic opioids, methamphetamine, or methamphetamine precursors seized; and

(3) the activities conducted by Chinese entities and nationals in furtherance of illicit fentanyl production in Mexico for drug trafficking purposes.

SA 2012. Mr. OSSOFF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 141, on line 8, insert ''and those that seek to assess the unintended or long-term ethical, privacy, and civil liberties implications of widespread adoption and application of AI systems'' after ''systems''.

SA 2013. Mr. OSSOFF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V of division B, add the following:

SEC. 2528. ENHANCING CYBERSECURITY EDUCATION.

(a) FEDERAL CYBER SCHOLARSHIP-FOR-SERVICE PROGRAM.—Section 302 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7442) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: ''In carrying out the program under this section, the Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and Secretary of Homeland Security, shall work with Historically Black Colleges and Universities, minority-serving institutions, and public institutions of higher education that have an enrollment of needy students (as defined in section 312(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(d)), to increase the participation of students enrolled in such institutions.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) to expand cybersecurity education opportunities, capacity, and teacher training for high-need schools and schools serving students underrepresented in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.''; and

(3) in subsection (m)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' at the end;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) the success of recruitment, retention, hiring, and placement of students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities, minority-serving institutions, and public institutions of higher education that have an enrollment of needy students (as defined in section 312(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(d))), and the level and nature of participation in the program under this section by such institutions.''.

(b) DR. DAVID SATCHER CYBERSECURITY EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Director shall—

(A) award grants to assist Historically Black Colleges and Universities, minority-serving institutions, and institutions of higher education that have an enrollment of needy students (as defined in section 312(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(d))) to establish or expand cybersecurity programs, to build and upgrade institutional capacity to better support new or existing cybersecurity programs, including cybersecurity partnerships with public and private entities, and to support such institutions on the path to producing qualified entrants in the cybersecurity workforce or becoming a National Center of Academic Excellence in Cybersecurity through the program carried out by the National Security Agency and the Department of Homeland Security; and

(B) award grants for a 5-year pilot period to build capacity to eligible Historically Black Colleges and Universities, minority-serving institutions, and public institutions of higher education that have an enrollment of needy students (as defined in section 312(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(d))) to expand cybersecurity education opportunities, cybersecurity technology and programs, cybersecurity research, and cybersecurity partnerships with public and private entities.

(2) APPLICATIONS.—An eligible institution seeking a grant under paragraph (1) shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may reasonably require, including a statement of how the institution will use the funds awarded through the grant to expand cybersecurity education opportunities at the eligible institution.

(3) ACTIVITIES.—An eligible institution that receives a grant under this section may use the funds awarded through such grant for increasing research, education, technical, partnership, and innovation capacity, including for—

(A) building and upgrading institutional capacity to better support new or existing cybersecurity programs, including cybersecurity partnerships with public and private entities; and

(B) building and upgrading institutional capacity to provide hands-on research and training experiences for undergraduate and graduate students.

SA 2014. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 3219L. SENSE OF SENATE ON ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL DRAWING RIGHTS BY INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND RELATING TO COVID–19 PANDEMIC.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is in the strategic interests of the United States to help ensure that COVID–19 vaccines are available to other countries, particularly poorer countries with limited resources, not only as a timely live-saving and humanitarian measure, but also as the best way to protect hard-fought gains made against the pandemic in the United States;

(2) the people of the United States will never be fully protected against the COVID–19 pandemic until the pandemic is also brought under control through vaccination around the world;

(3) the release of Special Drawing Rights by the International Monetary Fund, as was done after the 2008 global economic crisis, is a no-cost way to help poorer countries procure COVID–19 vaccines and protect against the instability caused by a severe economic downturn;

(4) helping protect against another global economic meltdown by releasing Special Drawing Rights is also a way to help protect United States export jobs at home, and why the move is supported by leaders of United States businesses and labor organizations; and

(5) any allocations of Special Drawing Rights approved by the International Monetary Fund to help with the purchase of COVID–19 vaccines and stem the worst economic impact of the pandemic should include ongoing efforts to discourage countries that are allies of the United States from exchanging Special Drawing Rights for hard currencies with rogue countries and follow-up by the International Monetary Fund to audit how such allocations were spent.

SA 2015. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V of division C, add the following:

SEC. 3505. POLICY OF UNITED STATES ON MAINTAINING SUPERIORITY OF UNITED STATES NUCLEAR FORCES.

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

(1) the modernization of the land-based intercontinental ballistic missile, ballistic missile submarines, and nuclear-capable heavy bomber aircraft is essential to maintaining a competitive edge over the People's Republic of China and providing security for allies of the United States in the region;

(2) continued support for the modernization of the nuclear triad will be a necessary consideration during ratification of any future arms control treaty with the People's Republic of China;

(3) the nuclear forces of the People's Republic of China will significantly evolve over the decade after the date of the enactment of this Act as the People's Republic of China modernizes, diversifies, and increases the number of its land-, sea-, and air-based nuclear delivery platforms;

(4) the People's Republic of China is pursuing a nuclear triad with the development of a nuclear-capable air-launched ballistic missile and improving its ground and sea-based nuclear capabilities; and

(5) new developments in 2019 further suggest that the People's Republic of China intends to increase the peacetime readiness of its nuclear forces by moving to a launch-on-warning posture with an expanded silo-based force.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to advance the strategic deterrence capabilities of the United States both quantitatively and qualitatively;

(2) to ensure the safety, reliability, and performance of the nuclear forces of the United States;

(3) to fully modernize the United States nuclear triad as needed to maintain the premier nuclear force on the planet; and

(4) that any new nuclear arms limitation treaties must include the People's Republic of China before ratification.

SA 2016. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 23, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(5) CONDITIONS OF RECEIPT.—

(A) REQUIRED AGREEMENT.—A covered entity to which the Secretary of Commerce awards Federal financial assistance under section 9902 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283) or paragraph (3) of this subsection with amounts appropriated under this subsection shall enter into an agreement that specifies that, during the 5-year period immediately following the award of the Federal financial assistance—

(i) the covered entity will not—

(I) repurchase an equity security that is listed on a national securities exchange of the covered entity or any parent company of the covered entity, except to the extent required under a contractual obligation that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(II) outsource or offshore jobs to a location outside of the United States; or

(III) abrogate existing collective bargaining agreements; and

(ii) the covered entity will remain neutral in any union organizing effort.

(B) FINANCIAL PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce may not award Federal financial assistance to a covered entity under section 9902 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283) or paragraph (3) of this subsection with amounts appropriated under this subsection, unless—

(I)(aa) the covered entity has issued securities that are traded on a national securities exchange; and

(bb) the Secretary of the Treasury receives a warrant or equity interest in the covered entity; or

(II) in the case of any covered entity other than a covered entity described in subclause (I), the Secretary of the Treasury receives, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury—

(aa) a warrant or equity interest in the covered entity; or

(bb) a senior debt instrument issued by the covered entity.

(ii) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions of any warrant, equity interest, or senior debt instrument received under clause (i) shall be set by the Secretary of Commerce and shall meet the following requirements:

(I) PURPOSES.—Such terms and conditions shall be designed to provide for a reasonable participation by the Secretary of Commerce, for the benefit of taxpayers, in equity appreciation in the case of a warrant or other equity interest, or a reasonable interest rate premium, in the case of a debt instrument.

(II) AUTHORITY TO SELL, EXERCISE, OR SURRENDER.—For the primary benefit of taxpayers, the Secretary of Commerce may sell, exercise, or surrender a warrant or any senior debt instrument received under this subparagraph. The Secretary of Commerce shall not exercise voting power with respect to any shares of common stock acquired under this subparagraph.

(III) SUFFICIENCY.—If the Secretary of Commerce determines that a covered entity cannot feasibly issue warrants or other equity interests as required by this subparagraph, the Secretary of Commerce may accept a senior debt instrument in an amount and on such terms as the Secretary of Commerce deems appropriate.

SA 2017. Ms. ERNST (for herself and Ms. HASSAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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. ____. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR RECIPIENTS OF NSF FUNDS.

The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 11 the following:

''SEC. 11A. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR RECIPIENTS OF NSF FUNDS.

''A grantee or subgrantee carrying out a program, project, or activity that is, in whole or in part, carried out using funds provided by the Foundation shall clearly state, to the extent possible, in any statement, press release, request for proposals, bid solicitation, or other document describing the program, project, or activity, other than a communication containing not more than 280 characters—

''(1) the percentage of the total costs of the program, project, or activity which will be financed with funds provided by the Foundation;

''(2) the dollar amount of the funds provided by the Foundation made available for the program, project, or activity; and

''(3) the percentage of the total costs of, and dollar amount for, the program, project, or activity that will be financed by nongovernmental sources.''.

SA 2018. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY COMPETITIVENESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Government of the People's Republic of China is investing in developing innovative technologies with commercial and military applications, including autonomous vehicles;

(2) the municipal government of Shanghai alone has planned investments of $15,000,000,000 over 10 years for research and development;

(3) the Government of the People's Republic of China has a strategy of promoting national champions, including in the autonomous vehicle industry, in order to overtake and replace foreign market leaders;

(4) technological leadership in the autonomous vehicle industry represents a global market opportunity worth an estimated $8,000,000,000,000;

(5) unless the United States enacts policies to protect the technological leadership of the United States in the autonomous vehicle industry against the People's Republic of China and other competitors, the United States risks losing that technological leadership; and

(6) maintaining the leading role of the United States in developing and producing autonomous vehicles is essential—

(A) to growing manufacturing jobs that support a strong middle class; and

(B) to achieving the safety and mobility benefits offered by autonomous vehicles.

(b) HIGHLY AUTOMATED SYSTEMS SAFETY CENTER OF EXCELLENCE.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) CENTER.—The term ''Center'' means the Highly Automated Systems Safety Center of Excellence established under paragraph (2).

(B) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Transportation.

(C) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Transportation.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Highly Automated Systems Safety Center of Excellence within the Department for the purpose of maintaining a workforce at the Department that is capable of reviewing, assessing, and validating the safety of automated technologies.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall—

(i) serve as a central location within the Department for expertise in—

(I) automation and human factors;

(II) computer science;

(III) data analytics;

(IV) machine learning;

(V) sensors and other technologies relating to automated systems; and

(VI) security; and

(ii) collaborate with, and provide support to, all operating administrations of the Department with respect to highly automated systems.

(B) REVIEW, ASSESSMENT, AND VALIDATION.—The workforce of the Center, in coordination with relevant operating administrations of the Department, shall advise on the review, assessment, and validation of highly automated systems to ensure the safety and security of those systems.

(C) AUTHORITY.—The activities of the Center under this subsection shall not supersede any certification authority granted to an operating administration of the Department under other law (including regulations).

(4) WORKFORCE.—The Center shall have a workforce composed of—

(A) employees of the Department, including—

(i) direct hires; or

(ii) detailees from operating administrations of the Department; or

(B) detailees of other Federal agencies.

(5) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection supersedes any law (including regulations)—

(A) granting certification authority to an operating administration of the Department;

(B) establishing certification responsibilities for manufacturers (as defined in section 30102(a) of title 49, United States Code); or

(C) granting authority to an operating administration of the Department to determine safety defects in regulated products.

(6) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 105 of division H of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (49 U.S.C. 102 note; Public Law 116–94) is repealed.

(7) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing—

(A) the staffing needs of the Center; and

(B) the staffing plan for the Center.

(c) MOTOR VEHICLE TESTING OR EVALUATION.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 30102(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''chapter—'' and inserting ''chapter:'';

(B) in each of paragraphs (1) through (13)—

(i) by inserting ''The term'' after the paragraph designation; and

(ii) by inserting a paragraph heading, the text of which is comprised of the term defined in the paragraph;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (13) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), and (15), respectively;

(D) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(1) AUTOMATED DRIVING SYSTEM.—The term 'automated driving system' means a Level 3, Level 4, or Level 5 automated driving system (as defined in the SAE International Recommended Practice numbered J3016 and dated June 15, 2018 (or a subsequent standard adopted by the Secretary)).''; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(6) HIGHLY AUTOMATED VEHICLE.—The term 'highly automated vehicle' means a motor vehicle that is equipped with an automated driving system.''.

(2) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS.—Section 30112(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:

''(10) the introduction of a motor vehicle in interstate commerce solely for purposes of testing, evaluation, or demonstration—

''(A) by a manufacturer that—

''(i) agrees not to sell or lease, or offer for sale or lease, the motor vehicle at the conclusion of the testing, evaluation, or demonstration;

''(ii) has manufactured and distributed into the United States motor vehicles that are certified, or motor vehicle equipment utilized in a motor vehicle that is certified, to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards;

''(iii) has submitted to the Secretary appropriate manufacturer identification information under part 566 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

''(iv) if applicable, has identified an agent for service of process in accordance with part 551 of that title (or successor regulations); or

''(B) of a highly automated vehicle, automated driving system, or component of an automated driving system if—

''(i) the testing, evaluation, or demonstration of the vehicle is conducted only by employees, agents, or fleet management contractors of the manufacturer of the highly automated vehicle, the automated driving system, or any component of such vehicle or system;

''(ii) the manufacturer agrees not to sell or lease, or offer for sale or lease, the highly automated vehicle, automated driving system, or component of an automated driving system at the conclusion of the testing, evaluation, or demonstration;

''(iii) the manufacturer has submitted appropriate manufacturer identification information under part 566 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), if applicable, or similar manufacturer identification information, including—

''(I) the name of the manufacturer (including a manufacturer that is an individual, partnership, corporation, or institution of higher education) and a point of contact;

''(II) the physical address of the manufacturer and the State of incorporation of the manufacturer, if applicable;

''(III) a description of each type of motor vehicle used during development of the highly automated vehicle, automated driving system, or component of the automated driving system manufactured by the manufacturer; and

''(IV) proof of insurance for any State in which the manufacturer intends to test or evaluate highly automated vehicles; and

''(iv) if applicable, the manufacturer has identified an agent for service of process in accordance with part 551 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 11028(a)(1)(A) of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (15 U.S.C. 1226(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''section 30102(6) of title 49 of the United States Code'' and inserting ''section 30102(a) of title 49, United States Code''.

(B) Section 3(a)(5)(C) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(5)(C)) is amended by striking ''(as defined by sections 102 (3) and (4) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966)'' and inserting ''(as those terms are defined in section 30102(a) of title 49, United States Code)''.

(C) Section 15(b) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2064(b)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''section 30102(a)(7)'' and inserting ''section 30102(a)''.

(D) Section 403(h)(5)(A) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 30102(a)(6)'' and inserting ''section 30102(a)''.

(E) Section 2 of Public Law 107–319 (49 U.S.C. 30102 note; 116 Stat. 2777) is amended by striking ''section 30102(6)'' and inserting ''section 30102(a)''.

(F) Section 101(8) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3911(8)) is amended by striking ''section 30102(a)(6)'' and inserting ''section 30102(a)''.

(d) HIGHLY AUTOMATED VEHICLES EXEMPTIONS.—Section 30113 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through ''means a motor'' and inserting the following:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) LOW-EMISSION MOTOR VEHICLE.—The term 'low-emission motor vehicle' means a motor'';

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) NEW MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY FEATURE.—The term 'new motor vehicle safety feature' includes any feature that enables a highly automated vehicle or an automated driving system, regardless of whether an exemption has already been granted for a similar feature with respect to any other motor vehicle model.

''(3) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Transportation.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through ''The Secretary of Transportation'' in paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(b) AUTHORITY TO EXEMPT AND PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) PROCEDURES.—

''(A) COMMENCEMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall commence a proceeding under this subsection when a manufacturer submits to the Secretary an application for an exemption or the renewal of an exemption in accordance with clause (ii).

''(ii) APPLICATIONS.—An application for an exemption or the renewal of an exemption under this subparagraph shall be filed at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(B) PUBLICATION.—On commencing a proceeding under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

''(i) publish in the Federal Register a notice of the relevant application; and

''(ii) provide an opportunity for public comment.

''(C) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall grant or deny an exemption or the renewal of an exemption for a highly automated vehicle by the date that is 180 days after the date on which the application for the exemption or renewal is received by the Secretary.

''(D) REVIEW OF PREVIOUSLY GRANTED EXEMPTIONS.—For any exemption granted by the Secretary under this section, the Secretary, not less frequently than annually, and before granting a renewal or otherwise increasing the number of highly automated vehicles of a manufacturer that may be sold or otherwise introduced into interstate commerce under the exemption, shall evaluate the impact of the exemption on motor vehicle safety to ensure compliance with any conditions established by the Secretary.''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(i) in clause (iii), by striking ''or'' at the end; and

(ii) by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

''(iv) compliance with the standard would prevent the manufacturer from selling, introducing, or delivering into interstate commerce a motor vehicle with an overall safety level at least equal to the safety level of nonexempt vehicles; or

''(v) the exemption would provide—

''(I) transportation access for individuals with disabilities (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)), including nonvisual access for individuals who are blind or visually impaired; and

''(II)(aa) a safety level at least equal to the safety level of the standard from which the exemption is sought; or

''(bb) an overall safety level at least equal to the overall safety level of nonexempt vehicles.''; and

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) ELIGIBILITY.—

''(1) SUBSTANTIAL ECONOMIC HARDSHIP.—A manufacturer is eligible for an exemption under subsection (b)(3)(B)(i) (including an exemption relating to a bumper standard referred to in subsection (b)(1)) only if the Secretary determines that the total motor vehicle production of the manufacturer in the most recent year of production is not more than 10,000.

''(2) SAFETY EQUIVALENCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a manufacturer is eligible for an exemption under clause (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subsection (b)(3)(B) only if the Secretary determines that the exemption is for not more than 2,500 vehicles to be sold or otherwise introduced into interstate commerce in the United States during any 1-year period.

''(B) HIGHLY AUTOMATED VEHICLES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to highly automated vehicles, a manufacturer is eligible for an exemption under clause (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subsection (b)(3)(B) only if the Secretary determines that—

''(I) during the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Endless Frontier Act the number of new exemptions granted for that manufacturer is for not more than a total of 15,000 highly automated vehicles to be sold or otherwise introduced into interstate commerce in the United States;

''(II) during the 1-year period immediately following the period described in subclause (I), the number of new exemptions granted for that manufacturer is for not more than a total of 40,000 highly automated vehicles to be sold or otherwise introduced into interstate commerce in the United States; and

''(III) subject to clause (ii), during any 1-year period following the period described in subclause (II), the number of new exemptions granted for that manufacturer is for not more than a total of 80,000 highly automated vehicles to be sold or otherwise introduced into interstate commerce in the United States.

''(ii) EXPANSION.—A manufacturer of a highly automated vehicle may submit to the Secretary a petition to expand the limit on new exemptions under clause (i)(III) to allow exemptions for more than 80,000 highly automated vehicles during any 1-year period if a similar exemption has been in effect for that manufacturer for a period of not less than 4 years.'';

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following:

''(2) SAFETY EQUIVALENCE.—An exemption or renewal under clause (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subsection (b)(3)(B) may be granted—

''(A) for not more than 2 years; or

''(B) if the motor vehicle is a highly automated vehicle, for not more than 5 years.''; and

(B) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through ''An exemption'' in the first sentence and inserting the following:

''(e) MAXIMUM PERIOD.—

''(1) SUBSTANTIAL ECONOMIC HARDSHIP.—An exemption''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) PROCESS AND ANALYSIS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Endless Frontier Act, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register that describes the process and analysis used for the consideration of an application for an exemption or the renewal of an exemption under this section for a highly automated vehicle.

''(2) PERIODIC REVIEW AND UPDATING.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) review the notice under paragraph (1) by the date that is 5 years after the initial date of publication, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter; and

''(B) update the notice if the Secretary determines that an update is necessary.''.

(e) DUAL USE VEHICLE SAFETY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 30122(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''A manufacturer'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a manufacturer''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in any case in which a manufacturer intentionally causes a steering wheel, brake pedal, accelerator pedal, gear shift, or any other device or element of design relating to the performance of the dynamic driving task by a human driver to be temporarily disabled during the time that a Level 4 or Level 5 automated driving system is engaged and performing the entire dynamic driving task.

''(B) CLARIFICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall apply at any time during which an automated driving system is not engaged.''.

(2) RULEMAKING.—If the Secretary prescribes a regulation in accordance with section 30122(c) of title 49, United States Code, to exempt a manufacturer (as defined in section 30102(a) of that title) from the prohibition under paragraph (1) of section 30122(b) of that title with respect to highly automated vehicles (as defined in section 30102(a) of that title), on the effective date of that regulation—

(A) the amendments to section 30122(b) of that title made by paragraph (1) shall terminate; and

(B) section 30122(b) of that title shall be in effect as if those amendments had not been enacted.

(3) LICENSING.—A State may not issue a motor vehicle operator's license for the operation or use of a highly automated vehicle (as defined in section 30102(a) of title 49, United States Code) in a manner that discriminates on the basis of disability (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)).

SA 2019. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division F, add the following:

SEC. 6302. REPORT ON COUNTRY-OF-ORIGIN LABELING FOR BEEF, PORK, AND OTHER MEAT PRODUCTS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly submit to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report on the ruling issued by the World Trade Organization in 2015 on country-of-origin labeling for beef, pork, and other meat products that includes—

(1) an assessment of the impact of the ruling on—

(A) consumer awareness regarding the origin of meat consumed in the United States;

(B) agricultural producers in the United States, taking into consideration other marketplace dynamics;

(C) the security and resilience of the food supply in the United States; and

(D) the continuity of trade and the fulfillment of trade obligations under the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada; and

(2) if the assessment under paragraph (1) indicates that the ruling had a negative impact on consumers in the United States, agricultural producers in the United States, and the overall security and resilience of the food supply in the United States, recommendations for such legislative or administrative action as the Secretary of Agriculture considers appropriate—

(A) to better inform consumers in the United States;

(B) to support agricultural producers in the United States; and

(C) to improve the security and resilience of the food supply in the United States.

SA 2020. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title II of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 3219L. FRAMEWORK FOR DISTRIBUTION OF COVID–19 VACCINES AROUND THE WORLD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 30 days thereafter until the date that is one year after such date of enactment, the COVID–19 Task Force shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and to the Committee Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the framework for the distribution around the world of COVID–19 vaccines produced in the United States.

(b) CONTENT.—The reports submitted under subsection (a) shall include updates, as appropriate, on the following:

(1) The number of vaccines procured by the United States and distributed through COVAX or through other bilateral or multilateral agreements.

(2) The number of vaccines procured by the United States that the Federal Government has allocated for potential future distribution through COVAX or through other bilateral or multilateral agreements.

(3) A framework for how countries will be prioritized for the delivery of COVID–19 vaccines provided directly by the Federal Government.

(4) A review of deployments of health and diplomatic personnel overseas engaged in COVID–19 response efforts.

SA 2021. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 210, line 7, insert ''the Department of Veterans Affairs,'' before ''and any''.

SA 2022. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 227, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(9) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—As part of the Initiative, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct and support research and development in engineering biology.

SA 2023. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is authorized to be appropriated for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to conduct research and development in key technology focus areas $3,500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(b) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Any amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization in subsection (a) shall supplement and not supplant any amounts already appropriated for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

SA 2024. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V of division B, add the following:

SEC. 2527. DELAY IN AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS UNTIL COMPLETION OF IDENTIFICATION OF EMERGING AND FOUNDATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for the Secretary of Commerce may be obligated or expended until the Secretary—

(1) completes the identification of emerging and foundational technologies as required under section 1758(a) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4817(a)); and

(2) issues proposed rules with respect to such technologies.

SA 2025. Mr. ROMNEY (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. UNITED STATES GRAND STRATEGY WITH RESPECT TO CHINA.

(a) FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) The United States is in a new era of geostrategic and geoeconomic competition with the People's Republic of China, a great power that seeks to challenge international norms, laws and institutions, and confront the United States across diplomatic, economic, military, technological, and informational domains.

(B) As it has during previous periods of great power competition, the United States must articulate and refine its grand strategy, including through rigorous testing of assumptions and by drawing on expertise outside the United States Government, to ensure its ultimate success, as well as global peace, stability, and shared prosperity.

(C) In January 1950, President Truman requested an in-depth report on the state of the world, actions taken by adversaries of the United States, and the development of a comprehensive national strategy, resulting in a paper entitled ''United States Objectives and Programs for National Security'', also known as NSC-68.

(D) President Eisenhower utilized experts from both within and outside the United States Government during Project Solarium to produce NSC 162/2, a ''Statement of Policy by the National Security Council on Basic National Security Policy'' in order to ''meet the Soviet Threat to U.S. security'' and guide United States national security policy.

(E) President Ford authorized the Team B project to draw in experts from outside the United States Government to question and strengthen the analysis of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(F) A model for United States strategy on a great power competitor is the January 17, 1983, National Security Decision Directive Number 75, approved by President Reagan, to organize United States strategy toward the Soviet Union in order to clarify and orient United States policies towards specific objectives vis a vis the Soviet Union.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should draw upon previous successful models of grand strategy to articulate a strategy that appropriately addresses the evolving challenges and contours of the new era of geostrategic and geoeconomic competition with the People's Republic of China.

(b) UNITED STATES GRAND STRATEGY WITH RESPECT TO CHINA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President first submits to Congress a national security strategy under section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043) after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall commence developing a comprehensive report that articulates the strategy of the United States with respect to the People's Republic of China (in this section referred to as the ''China Strategy'') that builds on the work of such national security strategy.

(2) SUBMITTAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date on which the President first submits to Congress a national security strategy under section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043) after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress the China Strategy developed under paragraph (1).

(3) FORM.—The China Strategy shall be submitted in classified form and shall include an unclassified summary.

(c) CONTENTS.—The China Strategy developed under subsection (b) shall set forth the national security strategy of the United States with respect to the People's Republic of China and shall include a comprehensive description and discussion of the following:

(1) The worldwide interests, values, goals, and objectives of the United States as they relate to geostrategic and geoeconomic competition with the People's Republic of China.

(2) The foreign and economic policy, worldwide commitments, and national defense capabilities of the United States necessary to deter aggression and to implement the national security strategy of the United States as they relate to the new era of competition with the People's Republic of China.

(3) How the United States will exercise the political, economic, military, diplomatic, and other elements of its national power to protect or advance its interests and values and achieve the goals and objectives referred to in paragraph (1).

(4) The adequacy of the capabilities of the United States Government to carry out the national security strategy of the United States within the context of new and emergent challenges to the international order posed by the People's Republic of China, including an evaluation—

(A) of the balance among the capabilities of all elements of national power of the United States; and

(B) the balance of all United States elements of national power in comparison to equivalent elements of national power of the People's Republic of China.

(5) The assumptions and end-state or end-states of the strategy of the United States globally and in the Indo-Pacific region with respect to the People's Republic of China.

(6) Such other information as the President considers necessary to help inform Congress on matters relating to the national security strategy of the United States with respect to the People's Republic of China.

(d) ADVISORY BOARD ON UNITED STATES GRAND STRATEGY WITH RESPECT TO CHINA.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established in the executive branch a commission to be known as the ''Advisory Board on United States Grand Strategy with respect to China'' (in this section referred to as the ''Board'').

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Board is to convene outside experts to advise the President on development of the China Strategy.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) REVIEW.—The Board shall review the current national security strategy of the United States with respect to the People's Republic of China, including assumptions, capabilities, strategy, and end-state or end-states.

(B) ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Board shall analyze the United States national security strategy with respect to the People's Republic of China, including challenging its assumptions and approach, and make recommendations to the President for the China Strategy.

(4) COMPOSITION.—

(A) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President first submits to Congress a national security strategy under section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043) after the date of the enactment of this Act, the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives shall each provide to the President a list of at not fewer than 6 candidates for membership on the Board, at least 3 of whom shall be individuals in the private sector and 3 of whom shall be individuals in academia or employed by a nonprofit research institution.

(B) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall be composed of 8 members appointed by the President as follows:

(i) Four shall be selected from among individuals in the private sector.

(ii) Four shall be selected from among individuals in academia or employed by a nonprofit research institution.

(iii) Two members should be selected from among individuals included in the list submitted by the majority leader of the Senate under subparagraph (A), of whom—

(I) one should be selected from among individuals in the private sector; and

(II) one should be selected from among individuals in academia or employed by a nonprofit research institution.

(iv) Two members should be selected from among individuals included in the list submitted by the minority leader of the Senate under subparagraph (A), of whom—

(I) one should be selected from among individuals in the private sector; and

(II) one should be selected from among individuals in academia or employed by a nonprofit research institution.

(v) Two members should be selected from among individuals included in the list submitted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives under subparagraph (A), or whom—

(I) one should be selected from among individuals in the private sector; and

(II) one should be selected from among individuals in academia or employed by a nonprofit research institution.

(vi) Two members should be selected from among individuals included in the list submitted by the minority leader of the House of Representatives under subparagraph (A), of whom—

(I) one should be selected from among individuals in the private sector; and

(II) one should be selected from among individuals in academia or employed by a nonprofit research institution.

(C) NONGOVERNMENTAL MEMBERSHIP; PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—

(i) NONGOVERNMENTAL MEMBERSHIP.—An individual appointed to the Board may not be an officer or employee of an instrumentality of government.

(ii) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Board.

(iii) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(5) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the President first submits to Congress a national security strategy under section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043) after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(A) appoint the members of the Board pursuant to paragraph (4); and

(B) submit to Congress a list of the members so appointed.

(6) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Board is authorized to procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum annual rate of basic pay under level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(7) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—The appropriate Federal departments or agencies shall cooperate with the Board in expeditiously providing to the Board members and experts and consultants appropriate security clearances to the extent possible pursuant to existing procedures and requirements, except that no person may be provided with access to classified information under this Act without the appropriate security clearances.

(8) RECEIPT, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND DISSEMINATION.—Information shall only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Board and any experts and consultants consistent with all applicable statutes, regulations, and Executive orders.

(9) NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) and section 552b of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Government in the Sunshine Act''), shall not apply to the Board.

(10) UNCOMPENSATED SERVICE.—Members of the Board shall serve without compensation.

(11) COOPERATION FROM GOVERNMENT.—In carrying out its duties, the Board shall receive the full and timely cooperation of the heads of relevant Federal departments and agencies in providing the Board with analysis, briefings, and other information necessary for the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

(12) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

(13) TERMINATION.—The Board shall terminate on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the President submits the China Strategy to Congress under subsection (b)(2).

SA 2026. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 4111(5), strike ''concrete and other aggregates,''.

In section 4117, add at the end the following:

(c) LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGGREGATES.—In this part—

(1) the term ''construction materials'' shall not include cement and cementitious materials and aggregates such as stone, sand, or gravel; and

(2) the standards developed under section 4115(b)(1) shall not include cement and cementitious materials and aggregates such as

stone, sand, or gravel as inputs of the construction material.

SA 2027. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike 2510 of division B and insert the following:

SEC. 2510. COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING ONLINE ACT.

(a) MANDATORY ORIGIN AND LOCATION DISCLOSURE FOR PRODUCTS OFFERED FOR SALE ON THE INTERNET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) DISCLOSURE.—It shall be unlawful for a product that is required to be marked under section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304) or its implementing regulations to be introduced, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in commerce on an internet website unless the internet website description of the product—

(i)(I) indicates in a conspicuous place the country of origin of the product (or, in the case of multi-sourced products, countries of origin), in a manner consistent with the regulations prescribed under section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304) and the country of origin marking regulations administered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

(II) includes, in the case of—

(aa) a new passenger motor vehicle (as defined in section 32304 of title 49, United States Code), the country of origin disclosure required by such section;

(bb) a textile fiber product (as defined in section 2 of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act (15 U.S.C. 70b)), the country of origin disclosure required by such Act;

(cc) a wool product (as defined in section 2 of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 (15 U.S.C. 68)), the country of origin disclosure required by such Act;

(dd) a fur product (as defined in section 2 of the Fur Products Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 69)), the country of origin disclosure required by such Act; and

(ee) a covered commodity (as defined in section 281 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638)), the country of origin information required by section 282 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1638a); and

(ii) indicates in a conspicuous place the country in which the seller of the product is located (and, if applicable, the country in which any parent corporation of such seller is located).

(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—The disclosure of a product's country of origin required pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) shall not be made in such a manner as to represent to a consumer that the product is in whole, or part, of United States origin, unless such disclosure is consistent with section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)) and any regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to section 320933 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 45a), provided that no other Federal statute or regulation applies.

(C) LIMITATION.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to a pharmaceutical product subject to the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration.

(2) CERTAIN DRUG PRODUCTS.—It shall be unlawful for a drug that is not subject to section 503(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353(b)(1)) and that is required to be marked under section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304) to be offered for sale in commerce to consumers on an internet website unless the internet website description of the drug indicates in a conspicuous place the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor that is required to appear on the label of the drug in accordance with section 502(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 352(b)).

(3) OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE.—A manufacturer, importer, distributor, seller, supplier, or private labeler seeking to have a product introduced, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in commerce shall provide the information identified in clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A) or paragraph (2), as applicable, to the relevant retailer or internet website marketplace.

(4) SAFE HARBOR.—A retailer or internet website marketplace satisfies the disclosure requirements under subparagraphs (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A) or paragraph (2), as applicable, if the disclosure required under such clauses or paragraph (2), as applicable, includes the country of origin and seller information provided by a third-party manufacturer, importer, distributor, seller, supplier, or private labeler of the product.

(b) PROHIBITION ON FALSE AND MISLEADING REPRESENTATION OF UNITED STATES ORIGIN ON PRODUCTS.—

(1) UNLAWFUL ACTIVITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided for in paragraph (2), it shall be unlawful to make any false or deceptive representation that a product or its parts or processing are of United States origin in any labeling, advertising, or other promotional materials, or any other form of marketing, including marketing through digital or electronic means in the United States.

(2) DECEPTIVE REPRESENTATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a representation that a product is in whole, or in part, of United States origin is deceptive if, at the time the representation is made, such claim is not consistent with section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)) and any regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to section 320933 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 45a), provided that no other Federal statute or regulation applies.

(3) LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.—A retailer or internet website marketplace is not in violation of this subsection if a third-party manufacturer, distributor, seller, supplier, or private labeler provided the retailer or internet website marketplace with a false or deceptive representation as to the country of origin of a product or its parts or processing.

(c) ENFORCEMENT BY COMMISSION.—

(1) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—A violation of subsection (a) or (b) shall be treated as a violation of a rule prescribed under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(2) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this section.

(B) PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Any person that violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) as though all applicable terms and provisions of that Act were incorporated and made part of this section.

(C) AUTHORITY PRESERVED.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

(3) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this division, the Commission, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department of Agriculture shall—

(A) enter into a Memorandum of Understanding or other appropriate agreement for the purpose of providing consistent implementation of this section; and

(B) publish such agreement to provide public guidance.

(4) DEFINITION OF COMMISSION.—In this subsection, the term ''Commission'' means the Federal Trade Commission.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 12 months after the date of the publication of the Memorandum of Understanding or agreement under subsection (c)(3).

SA 2028. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. AGREEMENTS RELATED TO NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN DEEMED TREATIES SUBJECT TO ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE.

(a) TREATY SUBJECT TO ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any agreement reached by the President with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran is deemed to be a treaty that is subject to the requirements of article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States requiring that the treaty is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, with two-thirds of Senators concurring.

(b) LIMITATION ON SANCTIONS RELIEF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions under any other provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented

prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future, unless the agreement is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate as a treaty and receives the concurrence of two-thirds of Senators.

SA 2029. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I of division E, add the following:

SEC. 5105. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CORPORATE AND FINANCIAL DEALINGS BY AMERICANS WITH THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that United States corporate, business, university, and financial entities, organizations, and their senior executives, all of which benefit from United States capital markets and the protection of our Nation's laws and military—

(1) should not engage in any activity, in the course of their dealings with the People's Republic of China, that would harm the United States or its allies, after considering the long term ethical, fiduciary, and competitiveness implications of such activity;

(2) should not enter into trades of sensitive technology or products, transfers of intellectual property, or monetary investment (whether directly or indirectly) with the Chinese Communist Party, entities owned or controlled by the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army, or for the benefit of any key industrial sector supported by the Chinese Communist Party if such dealings would—

(A) allow the Chinese Communist Party or People's Liberation Army to gain a comparative military advantage or advantage in the global economy;

(B) allow the Chinese Communist Party to stifle human freedom or perfect its technologically enabled police state at home and abroad;

(C) negatively impact the United States' competitiveness and national security; or

(D) would be counter to the objectives of this Act.

(b) KEY INDUSTRIAL SECTORS.—Examples of key industrial sectors referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) information technology;
(2) artificial intelligence;
(3) the internet of things;
(4) smart appliances;
(5) robotics;
(6) machine learning;
(7) energy;
(8) aerospace engineering;
(9) ocean engineering;
(10) railway equipment;
(11) power equipment;
(12) new materials;
(13) pharmaceuticals;
(14) biomedicine;
(15) medical devices; and
(16) agricultural machinery.

SA 2030. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV of division D, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ENCOURAGING DOMESTIC UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM INDUSTRY TO PARTNER AND COLLABORATE WITH UNITED STATES MANUFACTURERS OF CERTAIN SAFETY ACCESSORIES.

(a) COVERED SAFETY ACCESSORIES.—For purposes of this section, a covered safety accessory is a parachute recovery system that—

(1) is designed and manufactured in the United States; and

(2) the technology of which has been determined to be compliant with ASTM F3322-18.

(b) ENCOURAGEMENT.—Congress encourages the domestic unmanned aircraft system industry to partner and collaborate with United States persons who design and manufacture covered safety accessories to ensure interoperability between domestic products through investment in research and development.

On page 1217, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

(4) the ability of the unmanned aircraft system domestic market to partner and collaborate with United States persons who design and manufacture in the United States parachute recovery systems that use technology that has been determined as being compliant with ASTM F3322-18;

SA 2031. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1703 submitted by Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. SULLIVAN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, after line 10, add the following:

(e) GAO REVIEWS.—

(1) REPORT TO COMMITTEES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that analyzes, for the 20-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) the total amount spent by the Federal Government regarding the deployment of broadband, without regard to whether the source of that funding was appropriated amounts, user-generated fees, or any other source; and

(B) the total amount spent by State and local governments regarding the deployment of broadband, without regard to whether the source of that funding was appropriated amounts, user-generated fees, or any other source.

(2) ANNUAL ANALYSIS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of, for the year covered by the review—

(i) the total amount spent by the Federal Government, and State and local governments, regarding the deployment of broadband, without regard to whether the source of that funding was appropriated amounts, user-generated fees, or any other source;

(ii) the return on investment with respect to the investment described in clause (i); and

(iii) which Federal programs and agencies have engaged in activities regarding the deployment of broadband.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall make the results of each review conducted under subparagraph (A) publicly available in an easily accessible electronic format.

SA 2032. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 341, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 342, line 19, and insert the following:

(l) DETERMINATION RELATED TO OPTICAL FIBER.—

(1) PROCEEDING.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this division, the Secretary of Commerce shall commence a process to make a determination for purposes of section 2 of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1601) whether future transactions involving optical fiber manufactured, produced, or distributed by an entity owned, controlled, or supported by the People's Republic of China would pose an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States or the security and safety of United States persons.

(2) COMMUNICATION OF DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines pursuant to paragraph (1) that future transactions involving such optical fiber would pose an unacceptable risk consistent with that paragraph, the Secretary shall immediately transmit that determination to the Federal Communications Commission consistent with section 2 of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1601).

SA 2033. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation,

manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS REGARDING THE EFFECT OF THE DIGITAL ECONOMY ON THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term ''Assistant Secretary'' means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

(3) BROADBAND.—The term ''broadband'' means an Internet Protocol-based transmission service that enables users to send and receive voice, video, data, or graphics, or a combination of those items.

(4) DIGITAL ECONOMY.—The term ''digital economy''—

(A) has the meaning given the term by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce; and

(B) includes—

(i) the basic physical materials and organizational arrangements that support the existence and use of computer networks, primarily information and communications technology goods and services;

(ii) the remote sale of goods and services over computer networks; and

(iii) services relating to computing and communication that are performed for a fee charged to a consumer.

(5) DIGITAL MEDIA.—The term ''digital media'' means the content that participants in e-commerce create and access.

(6) E-COMMERCE.—The term ''e-commerce'' means the digital transactions that take place using the infrastructure described in paragraph (4)(B)(i).

(7) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce and the Assistant Secretary, shall conduct an assessment and analysis regarding the contribution of the digital economy to the economy of the United States.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS AND CONSULTATION.—In conducting each assessment and analysis required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) consider the impact of—

(A) the deployment and adoption of—

(i) digital-enabling infrastructure; and

(ii) broadband;

(B) e-commerce and platform-enabled peer-to-peer commerce; and

(C) the production and consumption of digital media, including free media; and

(2) consult with—

(A) the heads of any agencies and offices of the Federal Government as the Secretary considers appropriate, including the Secretary of Agriculture, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the Federal Communications Commission;

(B) representatives of the business community, including rural and urban internet service providers and telecommunications infrastructure providers;

(C) representatives from State, local, and tribal government agencies; and

(D) representatives from consumer and community organizations.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report regarding the findings of the Secretary with respect to each assessment and analysis conducted under subsection (b).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 25, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 25, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 25, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 25, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 25, 2021, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 25, 2021, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 25, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 25, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges until August, 13, 2021: Daniel Rankin, Chip Wyatt, Jacob Patterson, Nick Lolli, Phil Steinkrauss, Brett Abbott, Esther McGuire, and Justin Witt.

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

NATIONAL MPS AWARENESS DAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 235 submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 235) designating May 15, 2021, as ''National MPS Awareness Day''.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that 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. 235) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. WORNICK

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 236, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 236) to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in United States v. Wornick.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask 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. 236) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 26; 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 Calendar No. 58, S. 1260, as provided under the previous order; finally, that the Senate recess following the vote on the Sullivan amendment until 2:15 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:22 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 26, 2021, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

DARYL W. BALDWIN, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2024, VICE CAMILA ANN ALIRE, TERM EXPIRED.

GENINE MACKS FIDLER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2022, VICE JOHN UNSWORTH, TERM EXPIRED.

BEVERLY GAGE, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2024, VICE DANIEL IWAO OKIMOTO, TERM EXPIRED.

LYNNETTE YOUNG OVERBY, OF DELAWARE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2022, VICE ADAIR MARGO, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be lieutenant colonel

WHIT A. COLLINS

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

To be major

TIMOTHY E. HOLLAND

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

To be lieutenant colonel

KARL J. VOGEL

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

To be lieutenant colonel

NICHOLAS R. REYNOLDS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER A. BLANCO

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

To be major

CURT C. LANE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

DAVID P. CURLIN
JAMES J. FOSTER
JAMES P. HALL
DANIEL W. HARDIN
HYEONJOONG KIM
SCOTT B. KOEMAN
KEVIN M. LEIDERITZ
JAMES M. LESTER
TIMOTHY E. MARACLE
JOHN M. MORGAN
STEPHEN PRATEL, SR.
IBRAHEEM A. RAHEEM
HENRY C. SOUSSAN
SEAN S. C. WEAD
ERNEST P. WEST, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL R. BEAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DANIEL J. MEYERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JAMES M. MCKNIGHT III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CRAIG P. LANIGAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LISA M. KOPCZYNSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

TOBY J. ALKIRE
KEITH M. GRAHAM
SHANE MANWARING
BRIAN S. MARTINUS
CHRISTOPHER J. MILLER
JOE E. MURDOCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JEREMY C. ABRAMS
USTACYIA M. ALLENMCGEE
ANDREW W. ANDERSON
SHEYLA BAEZRAMIREZ
CHARLES J. BEIRNE
THERESA M. BODNAR
KRISTEN L. BROCKMAN
JEREMY BUKOWCZYK
ALEXANDER L. CARTER
SHEILA L. COKER
JAMES R. CORNETT
JARED T. CORSI
DOMINIQUE K. CUMMINGS
JOSHUA L. DALTON
MARK S. FLITTON
LINDSEY E. HALTER
TORIN K. HAMILTON
FREDERICK D. HOWARD
RONALD F. HUGHES
CARLOS JAFFETT
IVERSON JARRELL, JR.
DANNY C. JENNEJOHN
SERENA D. JOHNSON
BRIAN S. KANE
RALPH J. LEDBETTER
DEBBIE L. LIPSCOMB
CHARLES E. MARCUS
WILLIE L. MCFADDEN
STEPHEN T. MESSENGER
TINA H. MILLER
JENNIFER L. NOLAN
LILY A. OBERIANOBAYASEN
CURTIS C. OWENS
MARISA PACE
STIRLING D. J. POPEJOY
QUENTIN J. PORTIS
ALICIA M. RACKSTON
NAKIA REDDIN
WILLIAM S. RILEY, JR.
JAMES A. RIZER
CHRISTOPHER A. ROBACK
SHANE C. RUNDGREN
ERIC P. SAMARITONI
JOHN R. SHIPE III
LEONARD J. SLOAT
MARK S. SMITH
SOLOMON S. SPEED
STEPHEN S. TROTTER
CHRISTINE M. UDVARDI
CHARLES B. WAGENBLAST
DEMETRIA S. WALKER
ANGELA R. WALLACE
MICHELE B. WHITE
WILLIAM W. WOOD
BRIGITTA WOODCOX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DONNA M. ALEXANDER
MARK E. ALMOND
J T. AMUNDSON
ALVIN APONTE
SHAWN C. ARNOLD
JAMES H. BABBITT
ROBERT J. BEAUDRY
DARYL A. BELTZ
SEAN P. BENNETT
ADAM J. BERLIN
DENNIS A. BICKETT
DANIEL A. BOWLES
ROBERT E. BRAKE, JR.
CHRISTINE F. BROOKS
BARBARA G. BROWN
CURTIS A. BROWN
EDWARD A. BROWN, JR.
FRANCIS C. BROWN
CHRISTOPHER M. BUCK
MICHAEL H. BURGETT
JOHN D. BURNS, JR.
GREGORY CARBAJAL
MARK B. CARTER
GERALDINE CHANEL
BRADLEY H. CHANEY
JEREMY D. CHIGLO
TERENCE J. CHRISZT
MARK P. Z. CITARELLA
BRETT D. COMPSTON
CHARLES H. CONNORS
ROBERT J. COOK
JEFFREY S. CORELLA
DAVID J. CRAIG
PATRICK M. CRAMER
GARY W. CRINER
DAVID W. CROCKER
LANCE A. DANIELS
KERRY G. DAVIS
DEREK L. DEMBY
JOSEPH R. DEVRIES III
JOSEPH K. DICKERSON
RICHARD T. DOUGET
EDWARD J. DOWGIN, JR.
CHRISTOPHER S. DUNN
AARON G. DUPLECHIN
DANIEL K. DYGERT
DANIEL W. ECKERSON
JASON A. ELLINGTON
PATRICK L. ELLIS
ROBERT J. ENOCHS
BRYCE A. ERICKSON
STEPHEN J. FAHERTY, JR.
TROY J. FINK
JOHN R. FLEET
ONESIMO R. FRANCISCO III
MARK P. FRANK
JOSEPH V. FRATARCANGELI
ERIK J. FROEHLICH
QUINTON E. GERMAN, JR.
MARK F. GIACOVELLI
MOLLY G. GILLOCK
DAVID J. GREEN
DWAYNE W. GRIFFEY
BRENT O. GURLEY
DANIEL W. HABERREITER
KARSTEN J. HALL
DWIGHT M. HANKS, JR.
DAWN M. HARDEMAN
RUSSEL M. HARDEN
SHARON L. HARMON
CHARLES R. HARRIMAN
DAVID R. HATCHER II
DILLON B. HAYNES
ANDREW L. HEYMANN
SCOTT H. HIER
CASSANDRA L. HILL
ROBERT N. HINSON, JR.
ROBERT W. HITES, JR.
JOSIE J. HOBBS
PAUL W. HOLLENACK
CHARLES F. HOLLOWAY
ANTHONY W. HORVATH
BRIAN S. HOUSTON
PATRICIA A. HULL
SEAN P. IBARGUEN
WADE A. JOHNSON
SHAWN E. KEETER
AARON A. KELSEY
CYNTHIA M. KING
CORBY A. KOEHLER
CHARLES W. KOON
JASON M. LAFFERTY
ANTHONY S. LAIER

DAVID G. LAUER
TRAVIS L. LEE
JASON C. LEFTON
BRYAN J. LIBEL
WILLIAM S. LINDLEY
JAMES B. LINN II
THOMAS R. LUHRSEN
DANIEL P. MAEDER
DAVID L. MAGNESS II
JEREMY V. MAGRUDER
JOSE D. MALDONADO
DOMINICK A. MARTIN
DAMON P. MARTINEZ
DENNIS I. MARTINEZ
MATTHEW MASIAS
MARK W. MCCOY
CURTIS A. MCELROY
PHILIP J. MCGOVERN
WILLIAM N. MCMILLAN
THOMAS W. MCQUE
ZAIRE D. MCRAE
WILLIAM M. MEDLIN
KUKUNAOKALA MENDONCA
MARK A. MERRITT
ANTHONY J. MILES
KEVIN H. MILLER
ARTHUR S. MOORE
DOUGLAS H. MOORE
JUAN M. MORA
MELINDA A. MORIN
MATTHEW W. MORTON
EUGENE P. NAGEL, JR.
SCOTT P. NICHOLAS
ERNEST W. NORMAN
LEWIS W. NORMAN
COREY J. NORRIS
JAMES T. NORRIS
CRAIG A. NORTON
DAVID J. OHEARN
DANIEL R. OMEARA
DANIEL E. K. PADELLO
CHARLES M. PADGETT
JAMES L. PARSONS
KYLE A. PEARSON
GEOFFREY R. PENLAND
ARACELIS PEREZ
BRIAN L. PETERSON
DAVID L. PICKEL
ANDREW J. POLLART
MICHAEL J. PRIBIL
TIMOTHY K. PRICE
AARON A. RADLINSKI
CHARLES R. RANKIN
CHARLES B. REED
KEVIN E. REMUS
JOSEPH M. RHEES
BRAD E. RHODES
BRIAN D. RIESE
DAVID R. RIGG
JOHN K. RIVERS
ARTHUR S. ROARK, JR.
MAROCCO V. ROBERTS, JR.
GREGORY W. ROGERS
BOBBY D. ROMINGER
JASON D. ROWE
JAMES W. RUSH
EDMUND J. SABO II
JOHN F. SANDEFUR
ANTHONY Q. SANDERS
JAMES C. SCATES
DARIN D. SCHUSTER
STEVEN K. SELZLER
JEREMY S. SERENO
DAVID W. SHANNON
JASON W. SHEPHERD
MICHAEL D. SIRIANI
BENJAMIN C. SMITH, JR.
DEIDRE D. SMITH
LAWRENCE D. SMITH
MATTHEW P. SMITH
KENNETH N. E. SNOW
ROBERT P. SPAFFORD
MACK T. SPICKARD
DAVID R. STAPP, JR.
BRIAN G. STARK
TIMOTHY R. STARKE
MICHAEL R. STEINBUCHEL
JONATHAN M. STEWART
PHILLIP R. STILES
BRIAN J. STRAMAGLIA
MICHAEL A. STRAWBRIDGE
JOHN R. STUDINER
EDUARDO A. SUAREZ
ROBERT H. SURLES
RICHARD A. SZABO
BRANDON K. TORRES
JUSTIN E. TOWELL
JOEL B. TRAWEEK
CHRISTOPHER L. TROESH
STEPHEN P. TUCKER
JOHN V. UDANI
JESS E. ULRICK
DAVIS K. ULRICSON
PATRICK E. WADE, JR.
KENNETH J. WALSH, JR.
MILTON R. WARE
WILLIAM L. WEEDMAN
ROBERT J. WEEKS
JOSEPH F. WEISS, JR.
TERESA M. WENNER
DONALD D. WEST
CARLIN G. WILLIAMS
DANI S. WILLIAMS
HAROLD D. WILLIAMS
JAMES S. WILLIAMS
DAVID W. WILSON, JR.
MARC S. WRIGHT
CHARLES S. ZAKHEM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

ANTHONY C. BONFIGLIO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID A. ACOSTA
JEFFREY A. AGEE
CHRISTOPHER H. AMBROSIO
DONALD A. ANDERSON
VICKIE ARGUETA
STEVEN E. ARNTT
DORIS L. BADON
JUSTIN L. BAKER
JASON R. BALL
WYATT E. BALL
JOSEPH H. BAUGH, JR.
JOHN D. BEARY
JONATHAN W. BENNETT
ALI J. BESIK
THERESE D. BOHLMAN
STEPHEN J. BOHMAN
JAMES P. BOLLI
DANJEL L. BOUT
DIXON T. BROCKBANK
BENJAMIN W. BUCHHOLZ
MICHAEL H. BUCK
BRIAN S. CAREY
CONRAD C. CASE
DANIEL J. CASTORO, JR.
SHANITA K. CASTRO
ALFRED A. CHANG
JASMIN S. CHO
JOHN M. CIDILA, JR.
EDWARD M. CIURA
MARCUS M. CLAIBORNE
DWIGHT O. COLEMAN
JOHN P. COONEY
WILLIAM A. COY
ANDREW R. CRAVEN
CHRISTOPHER B. CREAGHE
ERIC B. CUNNINGHAM
JAMES D. CZORA, JR.
DARYAL R. DANLEY
MICHAEL A. DENGLER
ARTHUR A. DIEKMAN
NICHOLAS A. DILLE
JOHN DIMELING III
KEVIN J. DONOHUE
JEFFREY M. DULGARIAN
CHAD R. DUNHAM
STEVEN C. EDSALL
JERRY J. ENGLAND
DALE A. FATER
DUSTIN L. FELIX
STEPHEN M. FIPPEN
IAN D. FOX
AARON J. FRANCIS
THOMAS R. FRISBIE
SUSAN M. GANNON
JUAN C. GARCIA
JEFFERY A. GLINES
STACY L. GOODMAN
WILLIAM J. GORENFLO, JR.
DENNIS D. GREEN
JENNIFER T. GUERRERO
CHRISTIAN W. HALL
DANIEL R. HANSON
DERRICK T. HART
ROBERT D. HEGLAND
LISA C. HENDRICK
JESSICA M. HENNESSEY
KARL F. HERBST
RICKY S. HERRON
MATTHEW B. HILL
MICHAEL G. HILLSTROM
MATTHEW F. HIRSCH
GARY K. HO
TOBEY A. HUMPHRIES
ERIKK R. HURTT
VINCENT K. JACKSON
JOHN G. JAVELLANA
MICHAEL S. JOHNSON
BRYCE D. JONES
PETER M. JONES
JOHN J. KAIKKONEN
DAVID L. KASTEN
DANIEL J. KEENAGHAN, JR.
IKE W. KIM
THOMAS J. KIM
HELEN V. KING
STEVEN J. KNIGHT
JENNIFER L. KOSTIC
DAVID L. LANDON
JEREMY M. LATCHAW
BARRY B. LAW
BENJAMIN J. LINDSEY
KEVIN P. LISAC
CHRISTOPHER L. LISTON
BRIAN P. LOFTUS
EMERSON T. LONG III
RANDY D. LORENZO
BRIAN A. LOWERY
MICHAEL E. LUCY
KURTISS W. LUKINS
JOHN A. LYONS II
PATRICK A. MAHONY
JASON E. MARINELLI
JODI C. MARTIN
CASEY A. MARTINEZ
HECTOR S. MARTINEZNIEVES
MICHAEL Y. MASSEY
KEITH L. MCBRIDE
CRYSTAL L. MCCARTER
MICHAEL C. MCCASKEY
STEVEN G. MCCOMIS
THOMAS D. MCCRACKEN
JOHN P. MCFARLAND
KEVIN J. MCGOLDRICK
PETER S. MCINTIRE
JON F. MELLOTT
CARLOS D. MERCADO
KEVIN D. MILLER
DAVID MINASCHEK
SERGIO J. MOLINA
TIMOTHY D. MONAGHAN
WILLIAM D. MONTGOMERY
JASON A. MORHART
CHARLES C. MORROW
COLIN T. MULLANEY
ALAN D. MUNRO
CHRISTOPHER A. NAGELVOORT
DANIEL Q. NGUYEN
RYAN P. NOBLE
DANIEL P. NOWACKI
JAMES G. OSOWSKI
STEVEN M. PADILLA
MICHELL R. PASCUAGORDON
RYAN T. PATRICK
DAVID S. PELKEY
CHAD D. PENSE
ROQUE PEREZVELEZ
TITO G. POPE
JOSHUA B. PROWISOR
JACK S. REBOLLEDO
BRYANT V. S. ROGERS
JASON T. RUFFIN
AARON W. SAGER
BOBBY J. SAMUEL
MINARICO M. SANTIAGO
WILLIAM A. SCHARNITZKY
STACY M. SCHLOSSER
JACK A. SCHULTZ, JR.
TIMOTHY R. SHAFFER
JASON C. SMALL
SCOTT H. SOUTHWORTH
JEFFREY A. SPANGLER
SCOTT E. STATES
NICKLAUS B. STEWART
MICHEAL V. STOKES
DAVID B. STORCH
CHET C. STORRS
BRIAN D. SULLIVAN
STEPHEN M. SUSANN
JAMES M. SWAIN
RONALD L. SYKORA, JR.
ANDREW P. SZYMCZAK
DREW A. TECHNER
SCOTT A. TIKALSKY
JOHN P. TREVINO
GAVIN T. TSUDA
TIMOTHY T. TYLER
ANDREW D. UNWIN
SCOTT R. VANZEE
MATTHEW W. VEA
MARK R. VILLAGOMEZ
DANIEL M. WALLACE
ANDRE WASHINGTON
WALTER WATFORD
JOHN D. WATSON
CHRISTEL L. WHITE
KEVIN J. WHITE
HEIDI A. WILLIAMS
MATTHEW C. WILLIAMS
KIMBERLY D. WILSON
DAVID G. WOFFORD
JASON D. WOHL
KELVIN C. WONG
BRANDON T. YARBROUGH
KARLLUDIE YOUNG II
MEAGO H. Y. YUOTANG

IN THE MARINE CORPS

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

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH L. GILL II

IN THE NAVY

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

To be lieutenant commander

ANNE C. MOOSER

IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be colonel

HEATHER J. ANDERSON
CHANDLER P. ATWOOD
RICHARD R. BECKMAN
CHRISTOPHER P. BELL
JEFFREY W. BOGAR
HEATHER B. BOGSTIE
ROBERT J. BONNER
BRIAN L. BRACY
EDWARD P. BYRNE

EHREN W. CARL
TIMOTHY W. CHILDRESS
CHAD J. DAVIS
ROBERT W. DAVIS
KENNETH L. DECKER, JR
BRIAN A. DENARO
JOHN E. DUKES, JR
ANDREW J. EMERY
ERIC J. FELT
DAVID L. FERRIS
BRIAN M. FLUSCHE
RYAN P. FRAZIER
DANIEL A. GALLTON
AARON D. GIBSON
VANCE GOODFELLOW
ERIN R. GULDEN
JUNG H. HA
MICHAEL C. HARVEY
MATTHEW E. HOLSTON
CHRISTOPHER J. KADALA
RICHARD C. KIEFFER
LEA T. KIRKWOOD
SCOTT L. KLEMPNER
COREY J. KLOPSTEIN
JENNIFER M. KROLIKOWSKI
KALLIROI L. LANDRY
STEPHEN K. LANDRY
DAVID A. LEACH
DAVID M. LEARNED
STEPHEN D. LEGGIERO
SAMUEL A. LITTLE
BRYON E. C. MCCLAIN
WOODROW A. MEEKS
KHIRAH MORGAN
PETER M. NORTON
KRISTIN L. PANZENHAGEN
DOUGLAS W. PENTECOST
ERIN D. PETERSON
JEREMY A. RALEY
COREY M. RAMSBY
MARQUS D. RANDALL
ROY V. ROCKWELL
GILBERTO ROSARIO
JOSEPH J. ROTH
MARC J. SANDS
CHRISTOPHER G. SCHLAK
TIMOTHY A. SEJBA
MARK A. SHOEMAKER
BRIAN D. SIDARI
DOMENIC SMERAGLIA
ANDREW A. SOUZA
MATTHEW L. SPENCER
JEREMIAH B. STAHR
JON D. STRIZZI
BRETT T. SWIGERT
WALLACE R. TURNBULL III
DANIEL T. WALTER
ZACHARY S. WARAKOMSKI
JASON T. WARD
JAMES T. WEDEKIND

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTOPHER G. ADAMS
ROLANDO AGUIRRE
LOUIS J. ALDINI
SALVADOR ALEMAN
BRIAN G. ALLEN
KYLE S. ALLEN
MATTHEW R. ALLEN
ACHILLE H. P. ALOISI
ANDREW D. ANDERSON
CLIFTON R. ANDERSON
JAMIE L. ANDREWS
ALBERT J. ASHBY
LISA A. BAGHAL
DANE M. BANNACH
LAILA S. BARASHA
BENJAMIN P. BARBOUR
LANDON B. BASTOW
DAVID J. BATES
IAN S. BAUTISTA
BRANDON C. BEERS
MEREDITH S. BEG
JOSHUA M. BEKKEDAHL
MICLYNN E. BELL
BENJAMIN M. BENNETT
MACKENZIE J. BIRCHENOUGH
BRIAN W. BISHOP
JOHN D. BLACKMAN
ERIK E. BOWMAN
STEPHEN J. BROGAN
STEVEN B. BROOKS
RICHARD A. BROWN
KELLIE M. BROWNLEE
MATTHEW P. BRUNO
RAYMOND C. C. BRUSHIER
JOYCE A. BULSON
JEFFREY A. BURKE
DEREK M. CADA
KATHRYN R. CANTU
RANDALL E. CARLSON
SCOTT J. CARSTETTER
ROBIN C. CASTLE
KRISTEN C. CASTONGUAY
ADRIAN B. CERCENIA
NATHAN K. CHANG
BRIAN L. CHATMAN
DEVON T. CHRISTENSEN
MICHAEL W. CHRISTENSEN
RANDY S. CICALE
CORY A. CILIA
BRANDON C. CONYERS
JAMES E. COOPER
DAVID A. CORDER
JEFFREY E. COVERDALE
BARRY A. CROKER
MATTHEW P. CROSSER
SCOTT R. CUNNINGHAM
JUSTIN H. DEIFEL
JOHN E. DEMELLO, JR
CHRISTOPHER A. DEMPSEY
RACHEL M. DERBIS
JOSEPH M. DERIENZO
HEIDI L. DEXTER
WILLIAM T. DEXTER
MARK E. DEYOUNG
STEVE J. DIRKS
PHILLIP M. DOBBERFUHL
NATHANIEL J. DOUGLAS
GARRET E. DUFF
JOHN F. ECK, JR
ELLEN M. ELLIS
KURTIS ENGELSON
BRANDON L. ERWIN
CHRISTOPHER J. EVEY
JULIA A. FAUSTMAN
STEVEN P. FERGUSON
CARLOS J. FERRER
MATTHEW P. FLAHIVE
DARIN E. FORD
BREE B. FRAM
TERESA A. FRANK
BRIAN M. FREDRICKSON
BRIANNA M. FREY
JOSEPH M. FRITSCHEN
JEFFREY D. FRY
MANDI L. FULLER
MICHAEL S. FURMAN
THOMAS P. GABRIELE
CLIFTON C. GALERIA
BRANDON M. GALINDO
JEFFREY E. GALLAGHER
FRANK P. GIRDWAIN
GARY M. GOFF
KELLY R. GREINER
DARRELL L. GROB
MICHAEL C. GUERRERO
EDUARDO N. GUEVARA, JR
DUSTIN H. GUIDRY
ANNA E. GUNNGOLKIN
CHRISTINE G. L. GUZMAN
CRAIG J. HACKBARTH
ALAN M. HAEDGE
LUKE J. HAGEN
BLAKE B. HAJOVSKY
MATTHEW J. HALE
REBECCA A. HAMILTON
PATRICK W. HAMLIN
CHARLES F. HAMMOND
BRIAN E. HANS
MARK A. HANUS
PEDRO L. HERNANDEZ III
JARED A. HERWEG
DANIEL P. HIGHLANDER
RYAN M. HISEROTE
BRENDAN J. HOCHSTEIN
CARL N. HOWARD
EDWARD J. HURD, JR
RAYDON E. IMBO
CHRISTOPHER K. JAMES
MATTHEW JENKINS
AMBER M. JOHNSON
JAMIE J. JOHNSON
KIRK W. JOHNSON
TREVOR M. JOHNSON
EDWARD E. JONES
DANIEL R. KARRELS
JONATHAN K. KEEN
RYAN F. KELLY
MICHAEL L. KILLINGS
TAE H. KIM
PATRISHA J. KNIGHT
RICHARD A. KNISELEY II
RODRICK A. KOCH
KORT A. KOSER
JEREMY T. KRUGER
DAVID J. LAIRD
DEX Y. LANDRETH
PAUL A. LATOUR
RYAN C. LAUGHTON
MICHAEL D. LEAVER
DUSTIN W. LEE
ELLIOTT J. LEIGH
MARK B. LESAR
NATHANIEL C. LIEFER
ALAN C. K. LIN
BRYAN D. LITTLE
PATRICK W. LITTLE
NICHOLAS C. LONGO
CHARLES M. LOYER
MATHEW LUKACS
MICHAEL D. LYNN
DOUGLAS MACDONALD
LISA W. MANDES
ERNEST M. MARAMBA
ERIC D. MARSH
AMANDA L. MARTIN
JAROD MARTIN
KELLY MARTIN
STACEY N. MARZHEUSER
JACK J. MATEJKA
STEVEN MAWHORTER
JONATHAN F. MCCALL
RYAN D. MCDANIEL
KENNETH M. MCDOUGALL
CHESTER D. MCFARLAND
WALTER MCMILLAN IV
STEVIE MEDEIROS
ANDREW S. MENSCHNER
JONATHAN M. MILLER
JONATHAN L. MILLS
GENEVIEVE N. MINZYK
DYLAN A. MONAGHAN
DANIEL R. MONTES
GREGORY MORAN
SHYAM R. MUNSHI
KIMBERLY A. MYERS
DOUGLAS J. NELSON
TAN A. NGO
JOHN V. NGUYEN
JASON D. NIEDERHAUSER
STEVEN A. NIELSON
THOMAS I. NIX
JONATHON R. NOONAN
GEORGE B. NUNO
JACQUELINE A. NYBERG
JUSTIN M. OVERMYER
WILLIAM J. PALM
NATHANIEL A. PEACE
JOHN M. PECARINA
WILHEM A. PEREZ
KENNETH PETERS
GINA A. PETERSON
MASON R. PHELPS
JODIE J. PLEISCH
JOSEPH C. POMAGER
MARTIN POON
TRAVIS R. PRATER
ANTHONY J. PULEO
JACK J. RAITT II
LUKE REDERUS
DEREK K. REIMER
ANTHONY P. RIZZUTO
NEAL R. ROACH
SCOTT A. ROBERTS
CESAR A. RODRIGUEZ IV
RYAN A. ROSE
TAMMY A. ROSE
HOMERO H. RUIZ PEREZ
MICHAEL A. RUPP
BRIAN M. RUSSELL
MICHELLE SAFFOLD
DAVID O. SAMPAYAN
DAVID A. SCHILL
CHRISTOPHER C. SCHLAGHECK
KALUN J. SCHMIDT
MATTHEW M. SCHMUNK
ADAM M. SCHULTZ
KARL R. SCHWENN
JONATHON S. SEAL
ADAM G. SEARS
RUPINDER S. SEKHON
JEREMY J. SELSTROM
CLIFFORD J. SERATTI
JONATHAN P. SHEA
SAMUEL R. SHEARER
BRIAN A. SHIMEK
STEPHANIE M. SILVA
MICHAEL A. SIMONICH
ANDREW L. SINCOCK
STEVEN E. SLAGLE
GAIL M. SMICKLAS
DAVID J. SMITH
KENNETH J. SMITH
KIMBERLY D. SMITH
SOL R. SNEDEKER
MATTHEW SODERLUND
MORGAN E. SPARKS
AARON J. SPRECHER
JUSTIN B. SPRING
WILLIAM D. STEININGERHOLMES
BRADLEY J. STOOR
JAMES J. STRAUB, JR
KATHLEEN SULLIVAN
MARGARET A. SULLIVAN
TODD M. SULLIVAN
ERIC J. SULSER
JOHN J. TATAR
CHARLIE J. TAYLOR
NATHAN C. TERRAZONE
ERIC W. THOMPSON
ROBERT E. THOMPSON
MEAGAN L. THRUSH
JOSEPH W. TIMBERLAKE
JAMES P. TOBIN
TORI LEIGH N. TOUZIN
MARY R. TRAUTWEIN
ROBERTO A. TREJO
TIMOTHY W. TRIMAILO
SCOTT M. TYLEY
DANIEL A. URBAN
MARKYVES J. VALENTIN
ALLEN J. VARGHESE
MARSHALRIA M. VAUGHANS
LUDELL VIBAL
QUOC V. VO
NATHAN P. VOSTERS
JACK B. WALKER
CAROLYN J. WALKOTTE
ANDY Y. WANG
SHANE M. WARREN
ADAM E. WASINGER
OESA A. WEAVER
JESSICA A. WEDINGTON
JOSHUA WEHRLE
YU H. WEI
JASON E. WEST
DANIEL J. WHEELER
PAMELA L. WHEELER
ROBERT J. WIBLE
KEVIN W. WIERSCHKE
JONATHAN A. WILSON
SHEENA L. WINDER
DAVID R. WISNIEWSKI
CHRISTOPHER C. WOOD
STEVEN P. WRIGHT
MATTHEW C. WROTEN
MAX W. YATES
NATHAN J. ZAHN
SCOTT C. ZETTERSTROM

JOHN C. ZINGARELLI

To be major

FELIX A. ABEYTA
ADEKUNBI H. ADEWUNMI
JOEY B. AGUILO
CHRISTOPHER J. ALBAN
KELLY N. ALEXANDER
JASON A. ALTENHOFEN
MANUEL ALVAREZ
DANIELLE S. AMASON
DANIEL J. ANAYA
KEVIN B. ANDERSON
MUNSON J. ANDERSON III
TRAVIS A. ANDERSON
CHRISTOPHER R. ANDREWS
RONALD M. Y. AUNG
DAVID A. AYRES
CURTIS A. BABBIE
ERIC J. BAILEY
FLYNT L. BAILEY
ERICA J. BALFOUR
DANIEL N. BANAKOS
SEAN D. BARBER
GORDON L. BARNHILL
LUKE S. BASHAM
ERIC A. BASSETT
MEGAN F. BELGER
SCOTT L. BELTON
STEVEN L. BENTHAL
JACOB D. BILLS
JOHN P. BISZKO
ALDRIN P. BLASQUEZ
DONALD T. BLEEKER
KACEY E. BLUNCK
MATTHEW S. BLYSTONE
MARK A. BOATMAN
DAVID F. BOETTCHER
RUDOLPH T. BOWEN II
JUSTIN N. BOYD
ANTHONY C. BRADEN
MATTHEW S. BRADY
JORDAN R. BRATTON
GAVIN M. BRAWLEY
CHAD J. BRENNER
ANDREW J. BRINKER
ADAM B. BROWN
MICHAEL H. BROWNLEE
ADAM T. BRUNDERMAN
ANDREW J. BUCHANAN
CHELSEY L. BUCHANAN
LYNDSEY D. BUCKLE
CHERIE L. BUDAY
ADAM A. BURNETTA
DAVID P. BUTZIN
CHARLES J. CADWELL
ERIC THOMAS L. CAGURANGAN
ALAN L. CALFEE
JOSEPH R. CALIDONNA
CHRISTOPHER N. CALLAS
ANTHONY D. CALTABIANO
JEFFREY J. CAMPEAU
BRANDON W. CARPENTER
JAMES D. CARPENTER
TYLER D. CARSON
BRANDON K. CASTILLO
ROBERT F. CAULK
ELBERT G. CHAN
IVONNE J. CHARBONNEAU
MATTHEW T. CHARBONNEAU
KUAN H. CHEN
MATTHEW B. CHRISTENSEN
ANTHONY F. CIAMILLO, JR
FRANK CLARK
MICHAEL C. CLARK
KYLE D. CLEMENTS
NATHAN S. COLLINS
LUIS COLON
ANDREW J. M. COMPTON
MATTHEW M. CONRAD
RYAN C. CONWAY
MATTHEW M. CORK
TATIANA C. CORNIER
WILLIAM F. COSGROVE
JUSTIN E. COWLEY
CHRISTOPHER A. COX
JOHN R. COX
STEPHANIE M. COX
ALEX V. CRAVEN
COREY W. CROWELL
CARL M. CUNNANE
JUSTIN F. CUNNINGHAM
BRIAN A. CURD
BOYCE H. DAUBY
BRYAN L. DAVIS
ANA C. DE FIGUEROA
CHARLES S. DEBREE
JEREMIAH A. DEIBLER
EMMANUEL A. DELACRUZ
NATHANIAL E. DELEON
CHRISTOPHER P. DEMMON
ALLISON A. DEMPSEY
JONATHAN C. DENTON
AMBER N. DERIGGI
KEITH R. DERR
JOSEPH J. DIAS
GARRETT E. DILLEY
THEODORE J. DINKELMAN, JR
NATHAN A. DIRKS
JAMES C. DOSSETT
BRIAN R. DOUGAL
DOUGLAS E. DOWNS
SCOTT A. DRERUP
PHILIP R. DUDDLES
KYLE J. DUFAUD
ADAM B. DUNK
PATRICK W. DUVALL
AARON C. ECHOLS
DAVID P. EDSEN
ERIC J. EHN
STUART A. EVERSON
KADE P. EWERT
CHRISTINE M. EWING
BRIAN P. FARFAN
TRENT D. FAUSETT
MICHAEL S. FELTEN
EDWARD L. FERNANDEZ
GREGORY J. FERTIG
COLIN M. FINK
ALEXANDER J. FIORE
JORDAN A. FIRTH
NATHAN D. FISHER
SEAN R. FISHER
JEREMY D. FOX
MATTHEW J. FRANTZ
JONATHAN B. FULLENKAMP
ANDREW JAN G. GARCIA
MARSHA R. GOETZ BROWNING
JOHN GOFUS
LUKE J. GOLLADAY
ASHLEY E. GONZALES
JARED A. GRADY
HEATHER H. GREATTING DUFAUD
MATTHEW R. GREENWOOD
COLLIN M. GREISER
MATTHEW J. GRIDLEY
SABINA T. GRUSNICK
CHRISTOPHER A. GUIDA
DAVID H. GWILT
SHAWN W. HACKETT
JOSEPH T. HAHN
CRYSTAL D. HAMILTON
BRANDON C. HAMMOND
WESTON J. HANOKA
MEGAN L. HARKINS
JUSTIN D. HARMS
GREGORY C. HARTMAN
DAVID A. HEINZ
JASON C. HELLER
JACOB M. HEMPEN
STEPHEN K. HENDERSHOT
JOSHUAH A. HESS
JASON T. HILL
JONATHAN D. HILL
LIANGKUAN HO
JUSTIN L. HOCHSTEIN
HANNAH E. HOCKING
JONATHAN D. HOGAN
MATTHEW D. HOLLAND
ERIN N. HOLLMON
JASON A. HOLT
JASON M. HOLZMAN
SETH T. HORNER
MICHAEL A. HUFFMAN
JACQUELINE K. HULL
DONOVAN A. HUTCHINS
RUBEN I. IHUIT
AURELIO C. IRIZARRY
BRYAN V. JACKSON
KARA JARVIS
DEREK R. JELINEK
JAE H. JEON
BENJAMIN A. JEWELL
JENNY W. JI
RYAN R. JOBMAN
CLIFFORD D. JOHNSON
DONALD D. JOHNSON
KATHRYN J. JOHNSON
ROBERT B. JONES
MARIE S. JUAN ROQUE
ALEX M. JURGEMEYER
MATTHEW A. KAHLEY
STEFAN P. KATZ
JOSHUA L. KEENER
BRANDON L. KELLER
WILLIAM W. KELLEY
AARON J. KELLY
SCOTT J. KELLY
JONATHON D. KELSO
PATRICK C. KERR
BRIAN W. KESTER
MYUNG C. KIM
DANIEL A. KIMMICH
MONTGOMERY B. KIRK
KYLE S. KNIGHT
MATTHEW W. KNUTSON
NATHAN T. KOPAY
ALAN J. KOTOMORI
BRIAN G. KROEGER
RUSSELL P. KRONES
MICHAEL D. KUST
ROBERT A. LAKE
NICHOLAS J. LALIBERTE
JARETH D. LAMB
KYLE E. LAMBERTH
ROBERT B. LAMOTT
RICHARD L. LANSER
JAIME O. LARIOSBARBOSA
TOD V. LAURVICK
DEREK J. LAW
PATRICK T. LEARY
KEITH R. LEBLANC
SAMUEL H. LEE
THOMAS W. LEE
MATTHEW T. LEINES
ADAM G. LEMMENES
DEVIN K. H. LEONG
CHRISTIAN M. LEWIS
SHARON LAI MEI LI
PATRICK P. LIN
TIMOTHY P. LOCKE
JIMMY J. LOHRMAN
CHRISTOPHER R. LONG
JOSHUA R. LOUDERMILK
JASON P. LOWERY
TSU KONG C. LUE
KATHRYN D. LYONS
LEV S. LYUBCHENKO
JACOB E. MAJEWSKI
STEPHEN D. MAKSIM
MARTHA G. MALDONADO
JAMES P. MAND
TYLER B. MANN
CHAD J. MARGETSON
JOSEPH D. MARKOFF
DAVID F. MARTIN
GENELLE M. MARTINEZ
ORLANDO MARTINEZ, JR
ANDREW J. MASSINO
JUAN D. C. MAYSSONET
SAMUEL J. MCCABE
CHRISTOPHER B. MCGRATH
ERIC J. MCLAUGHLIN
ADAM M. MELSSEN
MICHAEL T. MEOLI
AVERY F. MERRIEX
DEVON L. MESSECAR
SAMUEL J. MEYER
DEREK D. MILLER
ERIC B. MILLER
TRAVIS J. MILLS
MICHAEL P. MOLESWORTH
MATTHEW E. MURPHY
MICHAEL M. MYERS
NATHANIEL P. NABER
KEVIN M. NASTASI
CARL J. NELSON
KALEB J. NELSON
TUNG T. H. NGO
EDUARDO NIETO
JEFFREY K. NISHIDA
GABRIELLE Z. NOCE
SAMUEL Y. O
EVE C. OCONNOR
MICHAEL C. OCONNOR
JOSEPH C. OLETTI
TIFFANY D. OLSON
RICHARD O. ORDONA
DANIEL J. OSULLIVAN
BENHUR E. PACER, JR
BRIAN O. PALMER
VINAMRA V. PANDE
ALEX J. PAUL
LINDELL E. PEARSON III
MICHAEL S. PEEPLES
NATASHA I. PEEPLES
ANDREW P. PENROD
DERICK I. PERRY
NEIL A. PETERSEN
MATTHEW E. PETERSON
BRIAN W. PITMAN
ADAM J. POHL
KEVIN J. POHL
TRAVIS POND
JONATHAN D. POOLE
MARK R. PRATT
RYAN G. PRIDGIN
JOHN P. QUINN
MANUEL A. RAMIREZ, JR
IKAIKA K. RAMOS
NATHAN RATSCHAN
MARISSA C. REABE
JULIE A. REED
SHANE L. REXIUS
WILLIAM T. REYNOLDS
AARON C. RHOADS
DENNIS ALBERT M. RICE
DANIEL E. RICHARDSON
BRADLEY C. RIGG
CHARLES F. RIORDAN
KEVIN C. RIVERS
JOHN R. ROBBINS
JOSEPH B. ROBINSON
JOHN J. ROH
CHRISTOPHER B. ROMANO
PAUL N. ROQUE
THEODOR B. ROSANDER
CHRISTOPHER W. ROSE
MICHAEL ROSENOF
CAMERON L. ROSS
KRISTA L. ROTH
HEATHER R. ROWE
KYLE E. ROWLAND
MRYAMN L. RUTH
MICHAEL H. RYAN
RALPH W. SALAZAR
RAQUEL V. SALIM
AMANDA J. SALMOIRAGHI
TANISHA J. SAUNDERS
MELISSA A. SAWYER
JERAD K. SAYLER
BRIAN K. SCHELLER
CHRISTA N. SCHIESSWOHL
NICHOLAS SCHMIDT
EDWARD C. SCHNEIDER
CHRISTOPHER M. SEIDLER
RYAN L. SHEEHAN
KYLE T. SHELTON
JOSHUA J. SHEPARD
EVANGELINE J. SHEPPARD
MATTHEW C. SHUTT
ADAM M. SIEVERS
ALEXANDER L. SIMPSON
CALVIN A. SINGH
ANDREW E. SINGLETON
IVAN S. SLATER
ANTHONY J. SLIGAR
ANDREW J. SMALL
JOSEPH R. SPEAKMAN
ANTHONY SPEZIALE

KEVIN J. SPRINGER
BLAINE L. STEWART
KRISTINA D. STEWART
MATTHEW A. STOEBNER
CHAD B. SUE
RAK B. SUNG
HOWARD TANG
YANCY Y. TANG
JUSTIN M. TARR
NICHOLAS TASSOS
ALVIN TAT
SEAN C. TEMPLE
BRIAN D. THORN
DOUGLAS E. THORNTON
ISSAC J. THORNTON
GERVE M. TILLMAN
CLAY R. TOERNER
MARK J. TOPINO
BENJAMIN A. TORRES
TUAN U. TRAN
PINAK M. TRIVEDI
THOMAS V. TRUONG
JARED D. TUINSTRA
JOSEPH M. ULISSE
TAN VAN
ZACHARY S. VAN VALKENBURG
ALBERT R. VASSO
KRISTIN L. VENTURA
ROMMEL O. VILLANUEVA
JOHN S. VINCENT
BRICE D. E. VIRELL
KEVIN P. VITAYAUDOM
BRANDON D. VOGT
DAVID M. WADDELL
PHILLIP F. WAGENBACH
KEVIN J. WALCHKO
LEE I. WATSON
MICHAEL E. WATSON II
WILLIAM O. WATSON III
JEFFREY M. WEIR
DANIEL P. WHALEN
SCOTT D. WHITE
DAVID C. WILBURN
BENJAMIN R. WILLIAMS
MCKAY D. WILLIAMS
MICHELLE Y. WILLIAMS
BRANDON V. WILSON
CORRY A. WINSLOW
BRITTANY L. WIRTH
JASON T. WIRTH
BARRY R. WITT
MARK J. WOJTOWICZ
DAMON R. WONG
BUTCH D. WOOD
JONATHAN W. WRIGHT
NICHOLAS Y. YEUNG
JING YU
SEAN ZABRISKIE
COSTANTINOS ZAGARIS
CRAIG M. ZINCK

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 25, 2021:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

CHIQUITA BROOKS–LASURE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KRISTEN M. CLARKE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on May 25, 2021 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

SPACE FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HEATHER J. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH CRAIG M. ZINCK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 22, 2021.

LYNETTE YOUNG OVERBY, OF DELAWARE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2026, PHYLLIS KAMINSKY, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON APRIL 29, 2021.

DARYL W. BALDWIN, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2026, VICE DAVID ARMAND DEKEYSER, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON APRIL 29, 2021.

GENINE MACKS FIDLER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2026, VICE JOYCE MALCOLM, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON APRIL 29, 2021.

BEVERLY GAGE, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2026, VICE NOEL VALIS, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON APRIL 29, 2021.