



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 2020

No. 121

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Mighty God, You are the strength of our lives, our safe fortress, and our shelter from life's storms. During this season of a raging tempest, speak Your peace to our Senators. Remind them that You continue to rule Your universe through the unfolding of Your prevailing providence, and that Your truth continues to march on in our Nation and world.

Lord, prosper the works of the hands of our legislators as they strive to glorify You with their thoughts, words, and actions.

May faith replace fear, truth defeat falsehood, justice triumph over greed, and love prevail over hate.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

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

RUSSIA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, if reports are true that Russia has been paying a bounty to the Taliban to kill American soldiers, this is a very serious escalation of what Russia expert Edward Lucas dubbed "The New Cold War." Mr. Lucas said that back in 2008.

This sort of movement by Russia, if it is proven—and there are a lot who believe with Russia it is possible—it demands a strong response. And I don't mean a diplomatic response.

We have had previous things like this happen with Russia. President Bush tried playing nice with Russia, then talking tough when Putin showed his true nature.

President Obama repeated this cycle—you know the word—"resetting" relations, despite Russia having just occupied parts of our ally Georgia, and then switching gears when Russia invaded Ukraine.

Putin is a KGB guy who understands only strength. His popularity has taken a hit lately. It makes him very unpredictable. That may be why he is doing these things, even though Russia has a reputation for doing them all the time.

So we need to increase deterrence on NATO's eastern flank. We should also hit back where it hurts.

Dictators like Putin fear their own people—and, of course, for good reason. Putin and his cronies have enriched themselves at the expense of ordinary Russians.

This week Russia is having a referendum on waiving term limits, allowing Putin to stay in power when his term is up. Of course, Russia will probably be conducting a rigged election.

We should point out to the Russian people that they don't have to accept that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

PROTESTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I had planned to speak first today about the NDAA. I had planned to discuss our work to ensure American servicemembers can protect our Nation and secure peace for the United States.

Unfortunately, the inexplicable passivity and weakness of local leaders in our own country has denied some citizens peace and security right here at home.

Here we are in Congress, equipping our Armed Forces to protect the homeland. Yet some local leaders have apparently felt it would be too politically incorrect to do their jobs and keep the peace.

It has now been 22 days since radical demonstrators seized control of several blocks of downtown Seattle, drove the police out of a precinct, and declared an autonomous zone, which the mob itself would rule.

It is worth pausing to consider how the mainstream media and leading Democrats might have reacted if tea party protesters in 2009 had forcibly created a breakaway zone within a major city and barred the actual authorities from entering. Somehow I am skeptical the press would have bent over backward to find a sympathetic light. Somehow I doubt these same politicians would have felt compelled to curry favor with the occupiers or flirt with their demands.

But we are talking about the American left in 2020. So, instead, what we get is a major newspaper lavishing praise—praise—on the "liberated streets" and a mayor and local government that have expressly declined to restore order and the equal protection of the law.

The mob has gotten its way.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4083

There have been numerous shootings in this lawless place. About a week ago, a 19-year-old was shot and killed. Last weekend, after yet another shooting, a 16-year-old is dead and a 14-year-old was injured. Some reports suggest these two boys were shot by a self-appointed security squad. These are miscellaneous citizens who roam the area with guns drawn after the occupiers drove the real police out.

We are talking about Seattle, WA, in the United States of America?

The rule of law cannot fade in and out with the fashions of the radical left. No leaders should have sacrificed small businesses to riots and mobs a few weeks back, and no leader should let threats or leftwing jargon persuade them to tolerate occupations for weeks on end.

I understand that, just this morning, Seattle's mayor finally—finally—released a new order that at last empowered police to bring an end to this. So let's hope the rule of law finally—finally—prevails.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on an entirely different matter, the Senate has indeed turned to what will be the 60th annual National Defense Authorization Act. If you look at the world news, it would appear we have done so not a moment too soon.

After months of threats, President Xi and the Chinese Communist Party finally delivered the punch in the mouth to the city of Hong Kong that they are calling a "national security law." As I and others have warned for months, it tramples all over the freedoms and autonomy that have set Hong Kong apart.

Today marks the 23rd anniversary of Hong Kong's handover from the United Kingdom. Normally this anniversary would have occasioned peaceful demonstration. Instead, the new law has brought scores of arrests and boasts from local authorities about how many peaceful demonstrators they have jailed, new harsh penalties for Hongkongers for new and vague offenses, and new authority from Beijing to intervene at will.

It appears to directly—directly—violate China's international promises and effectively end the "one country, two systems" policy.

I have discussed at some length the specific consequences China will face for this. I will continue to discuss them in the future.

This same week, we received new confirmation that China's ethnic cleansing campaign against the Uighur people in Xinjiang includes forced abortions, forced birth control, and State-enforced sterilizations on a systematic scale.

All of this is in addition to the international provocation that China has only stepped up during this pandemic—which they helped worsen—against Taiwan, against India, against the Philippines, and so on.

China is not our only adversary occupying the spotlight. Recent days have intensified questions about Russia's negative role in the Middle East.

I have long warned that Russia and other adversaries will exploit any American passivity or retreat from this important region. Whether in Syria or Afghanistan, the question is whether we will stand our ground and exert our influence or allow Iran, Russia, and terrorists to literally push us out of the region.

Sadly, as the Senate turns to the NDAA, the need to continue making swift progress on our national defense strategy is staring us plain in the face. Fortunately, Chairman INHOFE, Ranking Member REED, and our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee have put forward a bill that rises to the challenge.

The bill establishes the Pacific Deterrence Initiative. It lays out a clear vision for making our Pacific joint force more adaptable and our commitments to regional partners more feasible, smarter basing for forward-deployed Americans, more supplies and equipment prepositioned.

It will encourage more streamlined technology so that, from weapons platforms to information security, America and its allies in China's backyard stand ready to counter aggression together.

This NDAA authorizes full funding for the European Deterrence Initiative, doubling down on our NATO alliances as we check the worst impulses of Putin's Russia. The bill will further limit the information Putin gets pertaining to missile defense, bring more focus on tracking Russian support for terrorist proxies and despotic regimes, and renew our commitment to have U.S. forces support, train, and keep watch alongside our partners.

But it isn't enough to check our adversaries today. We also need to outrun them toward the future. So this legislation will also support critical reserves to help us secure a decisive edge in everything from hypersonic weapons to 5G communications.

Threats to our Nation are pulling American servicemembers in all directions. Fortunately, this NDAA has all of their backs.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter, while the Senate maintains the serious approach that builds bipartisan successes like the CARES Act and the Great American Outdoors Act, the House Democrats appear addicted to pointless political theater.

Well, our absentee neighbors have finally arrived back in the Capitol, and they have wasted no time resuming old tricks. The Speaker has chosen to spend the House's time this week on a multithousand-page cousin of the Green New Deal masquerading as a highway bill.

You don't have to take my word for it; the chair of the House Transpor-

tation and Infrastructure Committee said so. He said: "This is the application of the principles of the Green New Deal." And he is right, because here are the four pillars of the Green New Deal: No. 1, spend an insane amount of money; No. 2, check every far-left ideological box; No. 3, propose bad policies; and No. 4, forget about making law from the very beginning so you can legislate in a world of pure fantasy—pure fantasy. Check, check, check, and check.

This so-called infrastructure bill would siphon billions in funding from actual infrastructure to funnel into climate change policy. By putting a huge thumb on the scale for mass transit and electric vehicles, it revises the old Obama-Biden focus on disproportionately helping major metro areas, leaving less for the rest of our country. No wonder it came out of committee in the House on a purely bipartisan vote. No wonder the White House declared it not a serious proposal and made it clear this will never become law.

Naturally, this nonsense is not going anywhere in the Senate. It will just join the list of absurd House proposals that were only drawn up to show fealty to the radical left. Here in the Senate, we will keep at the serious work of our Nation.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 4049, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the following:

A bill (S. 4049) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Inhofe amendment No. 2301, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Portman) amendment No. 2080 (to amendment No. 2301), to require an element in annual reports on cyber science and technology activities on work with academic consortia on high priority cybersecurity research activities in Department of Defense capabilities.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

AMERICAN WORKFORCE RESCUE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, this morning, I have come to the floor with Senators WYDEN and BENNET to talk about a really bold new idea to extend enhanced unemployment assistance for as long as economic conditions in the country warrant it. I will speak about that legislation more in a moment, but first, two other issues.

S. 4049

Madam President, first, last night President Trump threatened to veto the National Defense Authorization Act—the bill on the floor this week—because it contains a provision to rename military bases named after Confederate generals.

Let me make a prediction. First, that provision will not change in this bill as it moves through the House and Senate. Second, let me predict that President Trump will not veto a bill that contains pay raises for our troops and crucial support for our military. This is nothing but typical bluster from President Trump. The NDAA will pass, and we will scrub from our military bases the names of men who fought for the Confederacy and took up arms against our country.

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, on a second matter, before I get to the main topic of this morning, all week, Democrats have been trying to force action on the Senate floor to make progress on crucial issues related to the COVID-19 pandemic. As Senate Republicans continue to mindlessly delay the next round of COVID-19 relief, we have tried day after day to jolt the Senate into action. Last night, we made notable progress.

In the late hours of last evening, we were able to pass a monthlong extension of the Payment Protection Program, whose loan authority expired at midnight with over \$130 billion left in the program. We had to force our Republican colleagues to act on this very simple and noncontroversial extension—a date change—to help small businesses across America, particularly underserved businesses, minority-owned businesses that had trouble accessing the PPP program in its early days.

Throughout the day, we heard, to our surprise, that our Republican friends might block the legislation, but when the time came, Senator CARDIN's consent request was agreed to. It certainly is something to celebrate, but I would have hoped that our two parties could have worked this out before last night as a small part of much broader legislation to address the many challenges posed by COVID-19 rather than a consent request forcing the Republicans to act.

But Senate Republicans, unfortunately, seem dead-set on delaying almost any action on COVID-19 until after July, after they have had time, in the words of Leader MCCONNELL, “to assess the conditions in the country.” The obstruction is deeply regrettable

and impossible—impossible—to explain.

We have other deadlines before us, not just the PPP. Today is July 1. With the first of the month comes a new rent payment for millions of American families who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. Senate Democrats, led by Ranking Member SHERROD BROWN, are going to ask the Senate to pass rental assistance and an extension on the moratorium on evictions. Will Senate Republicans agree to our request or leave millions of renters out in the cold?

I would say to my Republican friends, let the extension of the PPP program be a metaphor. Democrats are going to keep pressing for Senate action on COVID-19-related issues. Let the Republican response be quick and generous, not stingy and halting. Senate Republicans are going to have to respond one way or the other and either support urgent and necessary pieces of legislation or explain to their constituents why they are blocking them. It would be far better to pass these measures earlier rather than later and be more generous rather than stingy.

(The remarks of Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN and Mr. BENNET pertaining to the introduction of S. 4143 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 6

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I come to the floor this morning on an issue that is topical. It is an issue that, over the last several days, has become a national centerpiece of conversation.

It reflects a decision of just a few days ago by the Supreme Court that rejected President Trump's efforts to repeal deportation protections for Dreamers—young immigrants who came to the United States as children. In an opinion by Chief Justice John Roberts, the Court held that the President's decision to rescind DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, was “arbitrary and capricious.”

It was 10 years ago that I joined with Republican Senator Dick Lugar, of Indiana, on a bipartisan basis, to call on President Obama and beg him to use his legal authority to protect Dreamers from deportation. President Obama responded by creating the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. It provided for Dreamers temporary protection from deportation—2 years at a time—if they registered with the government, paid substantial fees, and passed criminal and national security background checks. More than 800,000 Dreamers came forward and received DACA protection.

DACA unleashed the full potential of these Dreamers, who are contributing to our Nation in a variety of ways—as soldiers, as teachers, as nurses, as

small business owners. More than 200,000 DACA recipients are currently “essential critical infrastructure workers.” That is not my term. It is the way President Trump's Department of Homeland Security describes the work of these DACA recipients now—200,000 of them “essential critical infrastructure workers.” Among those DACA recipients, 41,700 of them are in the healthcare industry. This includes doctors, intensive care nurses, paramedics, and respiratory therapists. They are the healthcare heroes we salute, and at the same time, they are the DACA recipients this President loathes.

On September 5, 2017, President Trump repealed DACA. Hundreds of thousands of Dreamers faced losing their work permits and faced being deported to countries many of them barely remembered, if they remembered at all. Thankfully, the Supreme Court stepped in and rejected that strategy by President Trump.

What was the President's reaction?

To no surprise, the President responded by attacking the Court and threatening to try to repeal DACA, even again, in the closing months of his first term.

Congress must step in immediately.

After that Supreme Court decision, President Trump tweeted, “I have wanted to take care of DACA recipients better than the Do Nothing Democrats, but for two years they refused to negotiate.”

Here is the reality. The President has rejected numerous bipartisan proposals to deal with DACA and the Dreamers.

May I be specific?

On February 15, 2018, the Senate considered bipartisan legislation that was offered by Republican Senator MIKE ROUNDS and Independent Senator ANGUS KING—a bipartisan measure. The bill, which included a path to citizenship for Dreamers, was supported by a bipartisan majority of the Senate. Why did it fail to reach 60 votes? Because President Trump openly opposed it. That is why. He said: I have a better idea.

On the same day that the Senate voted on the President's immigration proposal, we found his so-called “better idea” failed by a bipartisan supermajority of 39 to 60.

On June 4, 2019, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 6—on June 4, 2019, which was more than a year ago. H.R. 6, the Dream and Promise Act, is legislation that would give Dreamers a path to citizenship, and it passed the House with a strong bipartisan vote.

The Dream and Promise Act has been pending in the Senate for more than a year. I have come to the floor, day after day, and heard the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, bemoaning the fact that we are so busy here in the Senate and that the House just isn't doing its work. Yet the House has sent some 400 pieces of legislation to Senator MCCONNELL's desk—90 percent of it bipartisan. He refuses to consider it. He refuses to bring it to this empty

Senate floor so that we can do our work. One of those measures, sadly, is the Dream and Promise Act—the bill that would solve at least part of the immigration challenge we now face in America. Last week, I sent a letter, signed by all 47 Democratic Senators, calling on Senator MCCONNELL to immediately schedule a vote after the Supreme Court decision. As of today, the Senator has not replied.

Over the years, I have decided that the only way to tell the story of the Dreamers and the story of DACA is to introduce them here in the Senate. I have asked them to come forward, if they wish, provide me with photographs, and let me tell their stories. This is the 124th story I am going to tell. It is the story of a remarkable young woman named Cinthya Ramirez.

Cinthya Ramirez came to the United States from Mexico at the age of 4. She grew up in Nashville, TN. She wrote me a letter. Here is what she wrote about growing up:

Moving to the United States gave me the gift of education. I learned English by the first grade, and that is when I learned that I loved school and I loved learning.

While in high school, Cinthya was on the track team and was a student council representative and a great student. She graduated at the top of her high school class with the highest honors. Cinthya went to Lipscomb University, which is a private Christian college in Nashville, and she graduated with a nursing degree. Today, thanks to DACA, Cinthya works as a cardiac registered nurse at Vanderbilt University Medical Center—the largest hospital in Nashville, TN. Cinthya is on the frontline of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Here is what she writes about this experience:

I am a very spiritual person, and I pray a lot. I remind myself that this is the job that I was meant to have. If the time comes for patients to die and they cannot have their families with them, we have to be there for them.

Cinthya's greatest fear is that of bringing the coronavirus home to her family when she comes home after her nursing shifts at the hospital.

Here is what she writes:

I take every precaution before entering the house. I take off my clothes, clean my phone, go straight to the shower. The rest is in the hands of God.

I thank Cinthya Ramirez—a DACA recipient—for her service. She is an immigrant healthcare hero. She is a DACA healthcare hero. She is putting herself and her family at risk to save the lives of others. She should also not have to wake up every morning in fear that actions taken by the Trump administration will lead to her being deported back to a country she can barely, if at all, remember.

This is a classic example of this debate and what it is about—and to think that, in a year, we have not even taken up this issue that was sent to us by the House while it winds its way through

our judicial process all the way to the highest Court in the land, where the ruling was in favor of Cinthya and the DACA recipients who have this protection.

In that year, did we step forward in the U.S. Senate—the so-called greatest deliberative body on Earth—to even debate the bill that passed the House of Representatives? No. No, there was no time for that. As you can see, we are so busy here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

There is so much more that we could do here. Shouldn't we start with the highest priority—protecting Americans in the midst of this pandemic?

This woman, Cinthya Ramirez—undocumented, protected by DACA—risks her life every single day because of this pandemic. Can we risk ourselves politically for a minute in the Senate and actually take up a measure that could have a direct impact on the lives of the 800,000 DACA recipients and the thousands of others who could have applied for that protection during the months that we have debated this in court?

Sadly, we have been unable to do that, and it is all because of a decision being made by the President of the United States and by the Republican majority leader, and it is a decision which needs to be addressed directly.

In a few moments, I am going to offer a unanimous consent request, when it comes to moving this bill, that was sent over by the House of Representatives more than a year ago. I am really going to call the bluff of this President, who asks: Why doesn't Congress act? Why don't you come up with a bipartisan proposal?

Mr. President, here is our chance. Here is an opportunity.

We have a bill that has been sitting here for a year that would address Cinthya Ramirez's future and the future of thousands of others. The question is whether or not the Members on the other side of the aisle, on the Republican side of the aisle, will at least let us address this issue now.

Give us an opportunity to bring before the U.S. Senate a measure which is no surprise, nothing revolutionary or new. It is a measure we have considered in various forms over the last 20 years, but it is a measure that would address this issue and do it in a thoughtful way.

This is an opportunity which we should seize. Wouldn't it be remarkable, maybe a headliner, if the Senate actually did something—if we actually took an issue of the day that affected real people, real lives, in the middle of this coronavirus epidemic and actually decided that this young woman and thousands like her were worth the effort?

I think America would be shocked that this U.S. Senate responded that way, and don't tell me we have better things to do. I am all for doing the military authorization bill. We can get that done and be back in 2 weeks and take this up immediately. We know the

bill is here. We know that the bill is prepared and covers the areas that would protect this young lady and so many others and give them a future in the United States of America. At this point, it is really up to us.

Now, there may be an objection when I make this unanimous consent request. Listen carefully to the objection. It has nothing to do with resolving the issue before us—the issue of the future of this young woman and thousands of others just like her.

But we are in a position at this moment where we have to act. I am awaiting the arrival of a Republican Member, who I hope is on the way, and so at this point I am going to suspend and yield the floor with the hopes that we can return to another colleague coming to the floor momentarily.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I am here to urge my colleagues on the Republican side not to object—follow last night's example and allow this simple, humane, and good-for-our-economy amendment to go forward.

First, I want to salute Senator DURBIN. There has been no voice—no voice of any elected official whom I know who has had a stronger, longer, and more passionate defense of the DACA kids, many of whom are now adults.

And he has pricked the conscience of the Nation so that now the DACA kids and their families are, really, by most Americans respected and by many Americans just loved. I am one of those in the latter category. I love these kids and their families.

I have watched them, on the frontlines during the coronavirus crisis in New York, risk their lives, even though they are not allowed to be full Americans, to help.

Now we have an opportunity here to simply say: Stop harassing them. Let them do their jobs. Let them live their lives. Let them be with their families here in America so they can help us in our economy recover from COVID, as they have been doing, without looking over their shoulder and worrying about being deported or having one of their family members being deported every 5 minutes.

It is such an important amendment. It is so good for the country. The idea that immigrants are bad for America, that DACA kids are bad for America, is a regressive, nativist, and often bigoted idea that some use for political purposes, but nothing, nothing, nothing could be further from the truth.

So I urge my colleagues not to object to Senator DURBIN's fine amendment to help America live up to its ideals and

its dreams. That lady in the harbor in the city in which I live—"Give me your poor, your tired, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free"—that has been part of the American fabric for centuries.

This is a chance to bring us back to that fabric, that wonderful fabric that has been so good for our country for those centuries.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague and friend Senator SCHUMER. We have been fighting this battle for a long time, Senator.

Eight of us who came, four Democrats and four Republicans, put together a comprehensive immigration reform bill which should have passed 7 years ago—68 votes on the floor of the U.S. Senate. It was a bipartisan measure, which we joined with Senator McCain to put together to bring to the floor.

I thank you for your heartfelt comments.

I am going to speak a little longer and make a unanimous consent request.

This measure I am asking for unanimous consent on, the American Dream and Promise Act, was introduced by Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Democrat of California, on March 12, 2019, with 202 original cosponsors.

It would provide Dreamers, temporary protected status recipients, and individuals with deferred enforcement departure with protection from deportation and an opportunity to obtain permanent legal status in the United States if they meet certain requirements.

It passed the House of Representatives 237 to 187—7 Republicans joined the 230 Democrats who were present to support the legislation.

Protections in the American Dream and Promise Act would allow nearly 700,000 DACA recipients, as well as another 1.6 million eligible Dreamers brought to the United States as children to stay in our country legally.

The bill's protections would also allow over 300,000 temporary protected status holders and 3,600 individuals that I described earlier with the same opportunity.

It would create a conditional permanent resident status valid for up to 10 years that would protect Dreamers, including DACA, from deportation and allow them to work legally in the United States. Cinthya Ramirez could continue working as a nurse long after this pandemic is gone.

To qualify for this, the Dreamers would need to meet requirements. They must have come to the United States before the age of 18—she came at the age of 4—and continuously lived here for at least 4 years.

They must demonstrate they have been admitted to an institution of higher education, earned a high school

diploma or equivalent, or are currently in the process of doing that. She is a graduate of Lipscomb University with a degree in nursing.

They must pass government and background security checks, submit biometric and biographic data, demonstrate good character with no felonies, misdemeanor offenses of domestic violence, or multiple misdemeanor convictions, and they must register for the Selective Service, if applicable—she has already met all these standards by the examination she has been put through for DACA—and, of course, pay their application fee.

DACA recipients and other DACA-eligible Dreamers who still meet the requirements needed to obtain DACA would automatically qualify for conditional permanent resident status.

When the President ended DACA in September of 2017, we stopped accepting applications from those who were eligible. Now these young people would have the chance, if they meet the requirements and the test that is required of them.

They must complete one of three tracks: graduate from college or university or complete at least 2 years of a bachelor's or higher degree program in the United States; complete at least 2 years of honorable military service or have worked for a period totaling at least 3 years while having valid employment authorization; maintain continuous residence in the country; demonstrate an ability to read, write, speak English; understand American history, principles, and form of government.

It is a high standard, but it is one they are prepared to meet and they should meet to become part of America's future.

How important are they? Well, they are extremely important in every single State. We know that there are some 780,000 DACA recipients across the United States. There are 109,000 of them in the State of Texas—109,000. The average age of arrival for them is 7. They came here as kids. Their annual tax contributions are in the millions. I could read the numbers.

In the State of Texas, there are 30,000 of these DACA recipients who have been characterized by the Trump administration as essential workers—30,000—4,300 DACA healthcare workers in the State of Texas.

The States of Texas, Arizona, California, Florida, and others are going through a resurgence of infection and death from this pandemic. These DACA young people—many of them are on the frontline fighting this disease, as Cinthya Rameriz is in Tennessee.

The notion that we want them to leave now—4,300 leave Texas now—healthcare workers? Unimaginable. It makes no sense.

It is time for us to do something. At a minimum, for goodness' sake, in this empty Chamber, can we come together and debate this issue?

The President has challenged us to do it. Let's do it—not be afraid of it.

Put it through an amendment process on the floor. I have lived through that before. It actually would resemble the U.S. Senate, which many people remember from the history books, where people actually came to deliberate and vote on amendments. That is all we are asking for. Bring this under unanimous consent to the floor. Let's do it. The President has challenged us.

I am going to make a unanimous consent request. I see the Senator from Texas is on the floor here, and I want to make sure I get the right copy. Here it is.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 112, H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

You know, someone watching this at home might think that Senate Democrats want to actually enact amnesty for the so-called DACA recipients. Of course, they could have done so earlier.

President Trump offered Senate Democrats a deal that would have granted permanent amnesty for all the DACA recipients, and the Democrats turned it down. They didn't want the deal. They hoped, instead, to have an issue in November.

You know, we are right now in a time of crisis in our country. We have a global pandemic, and we have 44 million Americans out of work. This is, on the economic side, the greatest crisis our country has seen since the Great Depression.

Yet what we are seeing in the Senate is a continuation of something we have seen for several years, which is that today's Democratic Party doesn't value working men and women—American working men and women.

Last week, we saw a decision from the Supreme Court of the United States on amnesty. It was a particularly disgraceful opinion. Unfortunately, it was authored by Chief Justice Roberts; it was joined by the four liberals; and it concerned President Obama's illegal amnesty.

DACA, when it was issued, was illegal. Actually, for years, President Obama admitted that. When activists asked him: Will you decree amnesty unilaterally, as an executive, he told them over and over again: I can't do that. I am bound by Federal immigration laws. I am not a King. I am not an Emperor. That is what President Obama said repeatedly.

But then as the election approached, I guess they reassessed and decided that being a King or Emperor sounded pretty good, and so DACA, the day it was issued, was directly contrary to law.

Federal immigration law says in the statute books that if you are here illegally, it is illegal for you to stay, to get work permits, and the Obama administration ignored Federal immigration law and simply printed what were called work authorizations.

My friend from Illinois has a picture of a lovely young lady whom he has spoken about.

What he doesn't have a picture of is what happened after Executive amnesty was granted for those who came illegally as kids, which is that the number of unaccompanied children skyrocketed.

In the State of Texas I have been down to the border many, many times. I have visited with the Border Patrol many, many times. You know, when you go online, you see cages with children in them. What many of the people online don't tell you is that it was the Barack Obama administration that built those cages, and it was Executive amnesty that resulted in tens of thousands of little boys and little girls being sent alone with violent drug traffickers, with coyotes. Far too many of those kids were physically assaulted and sexually assaulted. You are not helping children by incentivizing little boys and little girls being in the hands of violent traffickers. That is not humane. I have seen child after child after child abused by this system, and every time the Democrats offer more amnesty, the predictable result is that more children are going to be physically and sexually assaulted. Amnesty is wrong.

It is also the wrong priority of today's Democratic Party. Their priority is on people here illegally and not on American workers, not on keeping American workers safe.

What we should be doing—and in just a moment, I am going to ask unanimous consent for this body to take up and pass Kate's Law. I am the author of Kate's Law in the Senate. Kate's Law is named for Kate Steinle, a beautiful young woman in California who was murdered on a California pier by an illegal immigrant who had come into this country illegally over and over and over again. He had multiple violent criminal convictions over and over and over again, but our revolving-door system kept letting him out.

As Kate Steinle died on that California pier, her father held his daughter in his arms, and her last words were "Daddy, please help me."

I have had the opportunity to visit with Kate Steinle's family. What happened to her was wrong. It shouldn't happen, and the reason it happens is that our broken system keeps letting go violent criminal illegal aliens. What does Kate's Law provide? Common-sense legislation that says aggravated felons—people with serious felony convictions—who repeatedly enter the country illegally face a mandatory minimum prison sentence; in other words, we are not going to let them out and allow them out to commit mur-

ders, rapes, and assaults. We are not going to let them out to abuse and threaten children.

Kate's Law is overwhelmingly bipartisan common sense. If you go into the great State of Illinois and ask the voters of Illinois "Does Kate's Law make sense?" overwhelmingly, they say yes. That is true in every State in the country.

By the way, it is true of voters who aren't just Republicans. It is true of Democrats, and it is true of Independents. It is true of everyone except the 47 elected Democrats in this Chamber and their colleagues in the House of Representatives because the reason Kate's Law is not the law is that every time I have tried to bring it up, the Democrats have objected to it.

If Kate's Law had been on the books, Kate Steinle would still be alive because the violent criminal who kept coming in over and over and over again illegally would have been in jail instead of murdering that young woman.

Amnesty is wrong. Illegal Executive amnesty is wrong, and we need to have as our first priority protecting the American workers and keeping the American people safe.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in my understanding that the Senator from Texas was going to offer a consent request.

Mr. CRUZ. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I think this is the moment to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—KATE'S LAW

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Kate's Law, which is at the desk.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, listen carefully to what we just heard from the Senator from Texas. First he talked about amnesty. Amnesty as I understand it is a blanket forgiveness for the commission of a crime.

Cinthya Ramirez has DACA—the DACA protection that I described—2 years at a time. She was brought here to the United States from Mexico at the age of 4. She has paid her fee, has gone through her background check, and receives 2-year protections to continue in this country. According to the Senator from Texas, that is amnesty for a crime—amnesty for a criminal. It is certainly not that.

This young woman has been as open with our government as she could possibly be, and for it she has received 2 years at a time to build a life, and what a life she has built. Undocumented and uncertain of her future, a person who is doomed by the Trump administration's policy finishes her medical education in nursing school at Lipscomb University, a Christian college in Nashville, and works at one of the best hospitals in the whole region, saving the lives of people who are facing COVID-19, and in the eyes of the Senator from Texas, she is just another criminal looking for amnesty. Really? I am sorry, that doesn't add up. It doesn't add up at all.

To say today that because we are seeking help on DACA, Democrats do not value American workers—another statement made by the Senator from Texas—may I remind the Senator that all of the people we are talking about in the DACA Program are currently in the United States legally working because of DACA? It is not as if they are taking jobs away by coming into this country and displacing others. Many of them are unemployed because of the economy too. She is doing work people are afraid to do, exposing herself to the coronavirus every single day.

You heard the routine she goes through when she comes home from work: taking off her clothing, rushing into a shower, washing off her cell phone, cleaning it before she sees her family. This is a person who is a criminal? She is a criminal for what she does, Cinthya Ramirez—really? I don't understand the thinking.

To call the decision last week—the week before—before the Supreme Court disgraceful is to say that she should have no chance. She should be gone. What has she got to offer to the United States of America, to the State of Tennessee, to our future? She has a lot to offer, and most Americans, even an overwhelming majority of Republicans, get that part of it.

Now the Senator comes before us today with a consistent record on Dreamers. Every moment that he has been in the U.S. Senate, whenever he has been given a chance—whenever—to help the Dreamers or to help DACA, the junior Senator from Texas has voted no, time and time and time again. He is consistent. Bless him for his consistency.

Today he is not even offering an alternative that would give this woman a chance—no alternative to the Dream and Promise Act. Instead he offers his own bill, which has nothing whatsoever to do with DACA and the Dreamers. The Cruz bill would increase penalties for immigration offenses, but anyone who commits any of the offenses that have been described by the Senator from Texas is already ineligible under DACA—ineligible. DACA requires applicants to clear criminal and national security background checks. Cinthya Ramirez has done that. To say that she is even close to committing a crime is an outrage.

Let's be clear. The junior Senator from Texas is in the majority in the U.S. Senate. If he were serious about advancing his bill, he could ask the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee to hold a committee vote on the bill. The Senator from Texas serves on that committee. Then he could ask the majority leader to schedule a floor vote. But he hasn't done that. This bill that he brings to the floor today he has not even introduced as a bill in this session of Congress.

In this session of Congress, with the Republicans in the majority, the immigration subcommittee chaired by the other Senator of Texas has held one hearing. The Senate Judiciary Committee has voted on one immigration bill. There has not been a single vote on an immigration bill on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Clearly, the Senator from Texas has no intention of trying to advance this bill that he passionately defended on the floor. He is offering it today to try to muddy the waters and somehow tie up this wonderful young nurse in Tennessee with a horrible crime that was committed in California. She had nothing to do with it. There is nothing in her life that is even close to that crime, and to put that as the alternative to DACA and the Dream Act is fundamentally and totally unfair.

As long as I am in the Senate, I will come to the floor of the Senate to advocate for Cinthya Ramirez and all of the Dreamers. What an American tragedy it would be to deport this brave and talented young nurse who is saving lives in the midst of this pandemic.

America is better than that. We must ensure that Cinthya and hundreds of thousands of others in our essential workforce are not forced to stop working. We need them now more than ever, and we must give them the chance they desire to let them become citizens of the United States.

Madam President, I object to the unanimous consent request by the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, COVID-19 has taken a wrecking ball to our Nation's health and economy. No corner of the United States has been spared.

Communities of color are being hit the hardest. We here in Congress must focus our work on helping these communities. We must take on the longstanding systemic reasons that these communities entering this crisis are

entering at a greater risk. We must enact real reform so that the next time the next pandemic or economic downturn hits, it is not these same communities that once again bear the brunt of the disaster.

Today, I want to focus our attention on American Indian and Alaska Native communities—communities where infection and mortality rates are much higher than the overall U.S. population and communities that can't escape the economic hardships this pandemic has caused.

We already knew that pandemics like this take an awful toll on Native communities. This was true 100 years ago during the 1918 flu pandemic when Native Americans died at four times the rate of the rest of the country. This was true a decade ago during the 2019 H1N1 outbreak when Native Americans died at the same high rates.

It is unforgivable that the administration was not better prepared.

The underlying reasons that Native peoples—whether living on Tribal lands, in urban settings, or elsewhere—are at risk are multifaceted. They are all rooted in historic systemic injustice.

First and foremost, many Native Americans do not have ready access to quality healthcare, despite the Federal Government's trust and treaty obligations to provide it—trust and treaty obligations taken on by this government in exchange for millions of acres of land and countless lives lost.

On the large, rural reservations and in remote Alaskan Native villages, the nearest healthcare facility might be hours away, and when you get there, if you can get there, there often aren't enough doctors or nurses or hospital beds.

These logistical barriers are compounded by the chronic, historic underfunding of the Indian Health Service, which many of us have fought for years to correct. While we have made progress, the IHS budget still only covers an estimated 16 percent of the need.

As a result of centuries of discriminatory land, agricultural, and environmental policies, Native communities also face the highest rates of underlying conditions, like diabetes, heart and lung disease, asthma, and obesity, that result in worse COVID-19 outcomes.

Battles over water rights and underinvestment in Tribal infrastructure have compounded the problems. We all know that washing our hands is a critical measure to prevent the spread of COVID-19. Yet Tribal communities are 3.7 times more likely to lack complete indoor plumbing than other U.S. households. On the Navajo Nation, which is confronting one of the worse coronavirus outbreaks in the Nation, 18 percent of households don't have complete indoor plumbing. So, again, it is no surprise that researchers have already found that COVID-19 cases are more likely to occur in Tribal communities, with a higher proportion of homes lacking indoor plumbing.

We also know that social distancing is key to preventing the spread of the virus. Yet almost one in six Native households is overcrowded, making social distancing not just difficult but physically impossible for many families.

All these institutional barriers combine to create a perfect storm. These barriers aren't the result of chance; they are the result of policy. It is these institutional barriers that we must acknowledge and finally address so that this pandemic is not one more example of the failure of the United States to meet our obligations. This time must be different. We must meet our responsibilities and help build a more just and equitable society.

Throughout this crisis, Native communities have fought back. They are resilient. They have fought back hard. For example, in my home State of New Mexico and in Arizona and Utah, the Navajo Nation has imposed strict curfews to prevent the spread. They have ramped up testing despite the complete lack of testing supplies in the beginning, and they have now, as of today, tested about 25 percent of their population, compared to 10 percent nationally.

Tribal responses to the pandemic have been repeatedly hamstrung by this administration and congressional inaction. As vice chair of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, I fought hard for funding targeted for Tribes. When the administration offered nothing for Tribes, we secured over \$10 billion in the CARES Act. When the administration fumbled distribution of Tribal funding, missing the statutory deadline for distribution by almost 2 months, Congress and the Tribes pushed back. Because Tribes are in crisis, days matter. It took a lawsuit and a Federal court order for Tribes to get their share of the \$8 billion set aside for them under the CARES Act.

Today, the Senate Indian Affairs Committee will hold an oversight hearing on implementation of Federal programs to support Tribal COVID-19 prevention, containment, and response efforts. Tribal witnesses will testify that policies and practices at FEMA, the CDC, HRSA, and a number of other Federal Agencies have made Tribal access to Federal COVID-19 resources much harder.

Whether it is denying Tribes access to coronavirus surveillance data, creating a confusing, Byzantine bureaucracy for requesting emergency medical supplies, or delaying access to grant funds, this administration continually makes decisions that disadvantage Native communities, decisions that threaten Native lives and prolong this country's legacy of systemic injustice.

The administration must do better, and Congress must do much more. Each day we fail to act to advance policies to address the disparities faced by Indian Country is a day we fail to uphold our oath of office. The Republican Senate majority has delayed far too

long. Infections are on the rise. The United States has surpassed every other nation in the world in the spread and death and destruction of this virus.

Now, 20 million Americans are out of work, which is the highest unemployment level since the Great Depression. State and local and Tribal governments and healthcare systems across the Nation are shuttering essential services and furloughing essential workers. None of this should come as news to the Republican majority.

Inaction in the face of this disaster is unconscionable. This body must get down to the business that we are here for and we are elected to do. It is long past time we pass another COVID-19 relief package. Our next package must include targeted funding and programs for Native communities and Tribes. We must infuse IHS with additional funding for Tribal healthcare and ensure it has parity in accessing Federal programs. We must provide Tribal governments with the resources they need to keep their communities up and running safely by providing \$20 billion in additional targeted funding within the Treasury's Coronavirus Relief Fund.

The Senate should pass bills I have introduced that have already been adopted by the House of Representatives in its Heroes package, which was passed over 6 weeks ago. We must make our strategic stockpile available to Tribes. Tribes should be able to access PPE, ventilators, and other necessary medical equipment just as States can. We must make sure that Tribes have equal access to the Centers for Disease Control and their resources to prepare for public health emergencies like this pandemic.

Seventy percent of Native Americans live in urban settings. Yet the Medicaid reimbursement rate for Urban Indian Health facilities is lower than the Federal reimbursement rate at other IHS facilities. We need to balance the scales and help the 43 Urban Indian Health facilities across the Nation expand their services.

As so much of our lives move to the internet, we must make sure that Native schools, healthcare facilities, and government services are not left on the wrong side of the digital divide. All Tribes must have access to high-speed broadband.

This public health and economic crisis has hit us all hard, but we shouldn't deny that some communities have been hit hard. We need to send immediate relief to those communities that have been so severely hurt, including Native communities, and we need to set our sights on genuinely taking on the systemic and institutional barriers these communities have faced for far too long. We can, we should, and we must do better.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today, with my colleague, the Senator from New Mexico, TOM UDALL, to call for urgent action by Congress to respond to the needs of Tribal nations and urban indigenous communities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

We have not done enough. We have not lived up to our shared trust and treaty obligations. And in this moment, we are called upon to respond to the historic injustice and systems of oppression and institutional violence that are harming communities of color and indigenous people.

Over the last month, people in Minnesota and across our country have focused our attention on the deep systemic inequities that Black, Brown, and indigenous people face. This injustice is not new. It is as old as the colonization of our country, but, colleagues, this is a unique moment.

This public health crisis presents us with an opportunity to show that we are serious about repairing the damage done by our broken promises to sovereign Tribal nations and urban indigenous communities.

Some have said that COVID-19 is the great equalizer, but we know that COVID hits hardest those without a safe place to call home, those struggling with low wages and poverty and lack of healthcare, and Black, Brown, and indigenous people living with the trauma of having their identity and their very humanity called into question, even before this virus spread.

The impact of COVID on Native communities has been devastating. Native people have been hospitalized for COVID at five times the rate of White people. In mid-May, the Navajo Nation reached a higher per-capita infection rate than any other hotspot in the country.

Why is it that COVID is hitting Tribal nations so hard? Despite repeated calls from Tribal leaders and urban indigenous leaders, over the past few decades, the Federal Government has stood by and allowed the budget of the Indian Health Service to dwindle. They have neglected Indian housing programs, and they have ignored growing health inequities.

The Federal institutions dedicated to serving Indian Country are not broken. Unfortunately, these institutions have never been adequate to live up to our trust and treaty responsibilities, and they represent a broken promise.

The Federal Government's failure has life-and-death consequences for Native people—for their health, for their well-being, and for their opportunity to provide for their families.

Think of this striking statistic: Unemployment in the indigenous community in the Twin Cities is at a terrible 47 percent—higher than any other group in our State.

Within Tribal nations, the economic impact of the coronavirus is equally devastating. Early this spring, Tribal governments in Minnesota and all around the country made the difficult decision to voluntarily close Tribal enterprises in order to protect public health. As a result, they lost significant government revenue and also experienced massive unemployment, not only for their members but for members from the surrounding communities. This lost revenue meant that Tribal governments were forced to scale back essential services, like nutrition assistance for elders, public safety, and education programming.

In the CARES Act, Congress agreed to \$8 billion in emergency relief to help Tribes respond to COVID. Even after congressional action, though, Tribal governments have had to continue fighting to get their fair share of those dollars. The Trump administration argued that some of this relief should go to for-profit Alaska Native corporations. Then it took the Treasury Department 40 days to distribute just the first 60 percent of the funds to Tribes, and not until 2 weeks ago, almost 3 months after passage of the CARES Act, did Tribal governments receive the rest. To be clear, these funds cannot be used to replace lost revenue.

We have so much work to do to fulfill our commitment to indigenous people and the simple proposition that Native families should have equal access to healthcare and housing opportunity as White Americans.

When I speak to Tribal leaders in my State about this cycle of historic underinvestment, inequity, and broken promises, I share their frustration. I don't know how anybody couldn't.

Indigenous leaders in Minnesota know that a lack of housing on Tribal lands leads to overcrowding, which increases the risk of contracting COVID. Tribes have asked over and over for sufficient funding for housing programs. They shouldn't have to ask anymore.

Indigenous leaders know a lack of access to healthcare and substance abuse disorder treatment lead to chronic health conditions, like diabetes, heart disease, and asthma, which worsen COVID symptoms. Tribes have asked over and over for sufficient funding to address these health inequities, and they shouldn't have to ask anymore.

Indigenous leaders know that a lack of access to credit and capital prevents urban indigenous households and folks living on Tribal lands from building wealth like their White neighbors, who can more easily, therefore, weather the storm of unemployment.

Native communities have asked over and over to enforce fair lending laws and to ensure access to credit for minority borrowers, and they shouldn't have to ask anymore. Long before COVID, these inequities have harmed indigenous people. Our inaction has placed Tribal nations in the untenable position of having to ask for what they are already owed.

So let's take this extraordinary moment—a terrible moment but a moment of real opportunity, a moment when our country is called to respond to this terrible pandemic and to reckon with systemic inequities that have hurt Native people and even sought to erase them—and let's turn this moment to good.

We have an opportunity not only to address the public health and economic crisis of COVID but also to live up to our obligation to Tribes, like providing them with the tools to build resiliency in their communities.

First, we need to provide rapid, flexible support to Tribal governments so that they can respond to COVID-19 and provide essential services to Tribal members at the same time.

Second, let's live up to our promises and fully fund the Indian Health Service and the NAHASDA housing programs. When we do this, we will be addressing the shortage of physical and behavioral healthcare for young adults and parents and elders, and we will make it easier for families to find affordable safe places to live and to build wealth through homeownership.

We can do this. It is within our power. We can end this cycle of underinvestment and institutional violence. This is the best moment in a generation to accomplish this.

I am committed to lifting up the voices of indigenous leaders in Minnesota and around this country. I follow their lead, and I will continue to advocate for these changes because they are so long overdue.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in this work.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

FOURTH OF JULY

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Mr. President, 160 years ago, Abraham Lincoln reminded us that "at all times . . . all American citizens are brothers of a common country, and should dwell together in the bonds of fraternal feeling."

That bond—our commitment to coming together to move our country forward, our embrace of the challenges our country faces because we know we will come out of these moments strong—has made the United States exceptional.

As we approach the Fourth of July holiday, I want to take a moment to recognize what makes America who she is today and the values that have allowed us to carry on the Great American Experiment for 244 years.

The United States—the shining city on a hill, the land of opportunity, the land of the free and the home of the brave, the red, white, and blue—our country is exceptional precisely because we have never settled for anything less.

It was that very reason it was Americans who first discovered electricity, built the airplane, put a man on the Moon, developed chemotherapy, and

that other countries look to us for leadership during troubled times. It is why we prevailed in two world wars, defeated the axis of evil, and have since maintained the greatest Armed Forces in the world. It is why the ideal of the American dream exists.

Importantly, it is the American people, past and present, who have shaped our American character—the 56 men who put their lives on the line to draft and sign the Declaration of Independence in 1776; the volunteer army of farmers and shopkeepers who defeated the British and today has grown into the best fighting force the world has ever seen.

Fifty-five Americans came together to write the U.S. Constitution, guaranteeing the freedoms for Americans to worship, to speak out, to bear arms, and to peaceably assemble. In the years that followed, America fulfilled its promise to form a more perfect union while acknowledging it is not perfect but always striving to do better.

We ended the injustice of slavery; 100 years ago this year, gave women the right to vote; overcame the Great Depression; fought for the equal rights of all Americans during the civil rights movement; and persevered after September 11.

Today we still have those heroes who make America what she is today. We see these works in our midst every day: our service men and women who bravely protect us across the globe and keep the enemy away from our shores; the dedicated men and women of law enforcement who work tirelessly to keep our communities and our families safe; our teachers, who provide the gift of education to our youth; our doctors and nurses, who save lives every day and have bravely taken on the challenge of COVID-19.

American exceptionalism started with our humble beginnings, and it has endured throughout the challenges our country faces.

It is tempting to focus on the divisions in America today, but we have much more in common that unites us. This Fourth of July is a reminder of the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that all Americans deserve.

President Reagan once said:

Freedom is a fragile thing and is never more than one generation away from extinction. It is not ours by inheritance; it must be fought for and defended constantly by each generation, for it comes only once to a people.

I agree, and I hope this Fourth of July we can stand together, proud that we will strive to make this country a more perfect union.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

S. 4049

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to address a glaring inequality in the law—one that leaves our servicemembers with fewer protections from discrimination than civilians. On June

15, the Supreme Court issued a momentous decision—welcomed by Members of both parties—extending civil rights employment protections to LGBTQ individuals in workplaces across America. That decision, however, does not apply to servicemembers. That means our servicemembers, who often come from communities that have for generations bravely sacrificed for the United States, currently enjoy fewer statutory protections than their civilian counterparts.

Think about what that says about our country: The law treats the people willing to risk their lives to defend our freedoms as second class citizens. It is unconscionable, and it is un-American. In this moment of reckoning on civil rights, we must ensure those rights extend to all of our military servicemembers.

The push for the desegregation of our troops, for gender integration into combat, and for the repeal of don't ask, don't tell were all met with similar arguments about how increased opportunity for the group in question would hamper readiness, unit cohesion, or otherwise weaken the military. Those arguments have been proven wrong every single time.

It is, in fact, the lack of protections for these groups that hamper readiness. Without protections, an able platoon sergeant can be stigmatized and driven from the military because he is transgender. His years of experience and the immense investments the military has made in him can be erased with the stroke of a pen.

Our military has grown only stronger as it better represents our country. But, right now, in the year 2020, people who are willing to make extraordinary sacrifices for our freedoms are being told no simply because of who they are.

We must do better. And we can. We can make sure the National Defense Authorization Act includes discrimination protections for all servicemembers.

My amendment with Senator COLLINS would codify in the law that servicemembers of all races, religions, and sexes are protected from discrimination. It would affirm that Americans of every race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, and national origin have the right to join and serve and sacrifice in our military.

I was proud to have Senator John McCain join me in leading similar legislation to protect transgender troops 3 years ago. The late Senator said: "Any member of the military who meets the medical and readiness standards should be allowed to serve—including those who are transgender." I hope this will be the year that we deliver the results he wanted for our troops.

Placing language safeguarding this right into the NDAA can help us begin to overcome an unfortunate legacy of creating artificial, blatantly unfair barriers to service by underrepresented groups. It is a legacy that continues to

this day with the Trump administration's ban on transgender servicemembers.

That discriminatory ban is not only an insult to members of the transgender community who have served our country; it is an insult to every LGBTQ person who has given their life to protect it. Arguments against open transgender service have no basis in experience or in science.

Transgender individuals served openly in the military for more than 2½ years without any readiness or cohesion issues. I know because I asked all four service chiefs and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and they all confirmed it. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mark Milley, who was then Chief of Staff of the Army, told me that he had received "precisely zero reports of issues of cohesion, discipline, [or] morale" caused by transgender individuals in the service.

The American Medical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and other experts agree: There is no medically valid reason to exclude transgender individuals from military service. Anyone who can meet the military standards should be allowed to serve—and serve in an environment free from discrimination. It is that simple.

Our Armed Services should reflect the best of what this country has to offer—in their values and in their ranks. We cannot allow for laws that unnecessarily limit their ability to recruit and retain the best person for the job.

I ask my colleagues to support our troops with more than lip service. I ask my colleagues to extend to them protections from discrimination based on race, religion, or sex. These are people who are willing to fight for our country. These are people who are willing to die for our country. This body and our country must be willing to fight for them. My amendment will do exactly that. I ask all of you to support its inclusion in this year's NDAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise again to address another issue. I rise because, according to the Pentagon's recent biannual survey, almost 21,000 servicemembers were sexually assaulted in the year 2018. That was a 38-percent increase from the year before.

I rise because the current climate of retaliation in our armed services and the lack of justice provided by the chain of command meant nearly three-quarters of those assaults went unreported, and less than 10 percent of cases considered for command action went to trial—less than 10 percent.

I rise because I stood in this very Chamber in 2013 and shared essentially the same statistics.

Year after year, the leaders of our armed services come to Congress and commit to making things better. They commit to us in hearing after hearing:

We will get this right. Yet, year after year, thousands of servicemembers are raped and sexually assaulted, and their assailants are not held accountable.

In many of those cases, the assailant is someone in the survivor's chain of command—the same chain of command that will decide the case, picking judge, jury, prosecutor, defense counsel—all decided by a commander in that chain of command.

There is no other judicial system in America that would ever allow this to happen. This system is not delivering justice. The chain of command is not delivering justice. These decisions—these fundamental civil rights decisions—need to be made somewhere else. They need to be made by trained, impartial military professionals, prosecutors, lawyers—people who are trained to make this very hard decision.

We are asking survivors to come forward in an environment where they know that there is less than a 10-percent chance that the chain of command will try their assailant for a crime and—worse—that there is only a two in three chance that they themselves—themselves—will face retaliation.

Despite repeated efforts to stamp out the scourge of retaliation against military sexual assault survivors, the most recent Pentagon survey found that 64 percent of these survivors have experienced some form of retaliation for reporting the crime. This figure is statistically unchanged from 2016. It is unacceptable.

I ask you: Who is this system designed for?

I think so often about a Marine veteran who told me:

When I reported the assault, my command responded with retaliation . . . ostracism, intimidation, and isolation. The humiliation of the retaliation was worse than the assault because it was sanctioned from those same leaders I once would have risked my life for.

The climate of retaliation comes from the top. It comes from the chain of command. They should not be deciding these cases. They do not have the background or the impartiality necessary to deliver justice. This system is broken, and it is failing our servicemembers.

This Congress has passed and spent hundreds of millions of dollars on incremental reforms since 2013. During this time, an estimated 137,000 servicemembers have been assaulted.

Let me say that again. During that time, 137,000 servicemembers have been sexually assaulted.

What are we doing here? Can we not hold the U.S. military accountable? Can we not do our jobs? Can we not stand up for the men and women who risk their lives for us every day?

Incremental change that leaves the power in the hands of the chain of command is not enough. We have the proof and the evidence.

"We've got this ma'am; we've got this." They say it every year. They don't have it, and they haven't had it for the last 7 years we have been fo-

cused on this very issue. It does not do enough to protect our servicemembers from sexual assault in the ranks or to punish perpetrators who commit these violent crimes.

Just for a minute, imagine this is your daughter or your son. Imagine just for a minute that your children decide to go into the military. Do you think they will be protected?

My bill, the Military Justice Improvement Act, is being offered as an amendment to the NDAA. This amendment will professionalize how the military prosecutes serious crimes like sexual assault, and it will remove the systemic fear that survivors have to report these crimes. Survivors don't report these crimes because they fear the retaliation against them.

This bipartisan and commonsense reform leaves the majority of uniquely military crimes, as well as all crimes punishable by less than 1 year of confinement, within the chain of command. It would only move one decision—literally, one decision—that only 3 percent of commanders actually have the right to make, and that decision will be made by a trained military prosecutor.

These prosecutors, or military JAGS, are required to be licensed attorneys in good standing with their State bar associations and are subject to professional rules of ethics. Those are commonsense standards, but they are not the standards that commanders have to meet. Commanders aren't typically lawyers. They are not typically criminal lawyers. They are not trained in how to make this fundamental decision about whether a crime has been committed. So why wouldn't you let military police investigate the crime just as they do today?

They take that investigation and, instead of putting it on the commander's general counsel's desk, they will put it on a military prosecutor's desk. The military prosecutor gets to make a decision: yes or no; I can prosecute or I can't. Then, that file goes right back to the commander. So when the commander wants to do nonjudicial punishment, he gets to do it. Every time a prosecutor says there is no case here, he gets to have the same authority he has today.

Under today's standards, only 10 percent of these cases go to trial. That would mean the commanders don't get to make that one decision that 3 percent of them get to make 10 percent of the time because 90 percent of the time it comes right back to the commander to do whatever nonjudicial punishment he or she thinks is appropriate.

This is a very small but important change because when you make this change, the survivor sees that the decision isn't being made within her chain of command. She or he sees that the decision is being made by somebody trained to make the decision—someone who is actually a prosecutor. He or she will then believe it is worth reporting the crime.

So many of these crimes don't even get reported and, sadly, the percentage of those that are being reported is going up—the percentage of those reported confidentially. It doesn't show that there is any faith in the system if people will only report if they don't name their perpetrator.

This reform is nothing new. This reform has been done all across the world by our allies. Our allies in the United Kingdom, Canada, Israel, Germany, and Australia have all removed reporting and prosecution of violent sex crimes out of the chain of command. Leaders in those militaries have reported that these changes have not diminished their ability in any way. It has not diminished their commanders' ability to maintain good order and discipline, to train their troops, and to do what they are there for.

Congress owes our servicemembers a debt of gratitude that can never be fully repaid. These brave men and women who have experienced the unimaginable are counting on us this year to finally take real action. Until we do, we continue to fail in our responsibility to protect them.

Madam President, this is something we have worked on together for over 7 years. This is something that, on a bipartisan basis, this Chamber has worked on for 7 years. We have been denied a vote on this over the last 5 years—denied a vote on this the last 5 years. The military has fought tooth and nail to not put in these fundamental reforms. They ask us over and over: Trust us; we got this. Trust us; we got this.

They don't have it. They haven't had it, and they don't focus on it.

If you just look at the report from this year alone, we are up to 20,000—over 20,000—sexual assaults in the last year. The percentage of cases that are being reported confidentially is going up. The percentage of cases that are being reported openly is going down. The percentage of cases that are going to trial is going down. The percentage of cases ending in conviction is going down. So under no measure today has the military succeeded in this mission, under absolutely none. They say they got this. They don't have it. They never have. And if we don't do our job this year, they never will.

This is not something new. This is something that other countries that are our allies have done. It professionalizes the military. It gives hope to survivors. It creates permission for them to report these crimes. If more crimes are reported, more prosecutions will be completed, and more cases will end in conviction.

Send a message: Convict perpetrators. Protect survivors. Honor the sacrifice and legacy of every man and woman who serves in the military today who will give their life for this country. That is our responsibility.

I urge everyone in this Chamber to stand with our troops. Stand with the men and women who sacrifice every-

thing, and do the right thing. It is our job. We are supposed to provide oversight and accountability over the U.S. military. It is the Senate's job, and every year that we don't address this fundamental scourge is another year we fail.

I am tired of this Chamber failing our servicemembers. I am tired of our commanders and our military failing our servicemembers. We owe everything to them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, last night, the Senate approved legislation to extended the Paycheck Protection Program, better known as PPP, through August 8, while we continue bipartisan negotiations on a bill to provide additional assistance to our small businesses that have been especially hard hit by COVID-19 mitigation measures.

I very much hope that the House of Representatives will act quickly to extend this important lifeline for our small employers, as new PPP loans cannot be issued until the bill that passed the Senate last night is enacted and signed into law, even though approximately \$130 billion remains available for the program.

Let me, again, commend my partners in this endeavor, Senators MARCO RUBIO, BEN CARDIN, and JEANNE SHAHEEN, for their continued work on this vital program.

Back in March, the four of us formed a small business task force. We looked at ways that we could help our small employers and their employees survive this pandemic. We put forth a bold plan, the Paycheck Protection Program, to help small employers and their employees. Our concept was straightforward: provide forgivable loans to small employers to help them maintain that vital connection with their employees, so that both could rebound and thrive once the pandemic passes.

In some cases, that meant that a small business could retain an employee who, otherwise, would have been laid off. In others, it has meant that the small business could recall workers who had already been laid off. And in yet other cases, it allowed employers to continue to send paychecks to employees who had been furloughed so that we could keep that link between employers and their employees, so that when the reopening occurred, they could be reunited quickly and the business could get up and running much more rapidly.

The response to this program has been phenomenal. Since its launch in

early April, it has provided \$518 billion in forgivable loans to 4.8 million small employers across the Nation.

According to an ongoing U.S. Census Survey, nearly three out of every four small business respondents reported that they had received assistance under the PPP program. In Maine, nearly 27,000 small businesses have received forgivable loans, totaling more than \$2.2 billion. Just to give you an idea of how much of a stimulus that is, that is equal to almost half of the entire State budget. That works out to an average loan size of \$83,400, which translates into a small business with approximately seven employees. All told, this program is helping to sustain nearly 200,000 jobs in the State of Maine.

As Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin testified last month:

The [Paycheck Protection Program] is supporting the employment of approximately 50 million workers and more than 75 percent of small business payroll in all 50 states. This is an extraordinary achievement.

It is, indeed. It has made such a difference to our small employers. It has kept our small businesses afloat, prevented them from giving up and shuttering their doors forever, and provided paychecks to their employees.

When we first drafted this program in early March, we did not know how long government-ordered closures would last. In fact, most of them had not even gone into effect at the time that we drafted the law. We also did not know how severe the impacts of these government-ordered closures would be. We did not know how long the pandemic would last. How I wish that we could announce today that COVID-19 had been conquered; that America's small businesses were flourishing once again; and that the millions of jobs that they provide had been fully restored. Unfortunately, that is not the case, and we have a long road ahead of us.

According to a survey released last week by NFIB, an organization that is dedicated to providing a voice for America's small businesses, half of its members anticipate needing additional financial support in the next 12 months.

I fear that, if Congress fails to act, despite our good work to date, millions of our small businesses will be put at risk, and millions of jobs will be lost.

A case study of how the pandemic has threatened the viability of small businesses can be found in Maine's tourism sector. Tourism is one of our State's largest economic sectors. It supports 110,000 jobs. That is one out of every six jobs in our State. In 2018, total tourism expenditures exceeded \$6.2 billion. That is \$7 million per day.

In late March, there was the expectation that the 2020 tourism season would certainly be lower than the norm but active enough for the tourism businesses to survive. But, as the Fourth of July draws closer, near empty hotels, inns, B&Bs, and restaurants portend a long-lasting disaster, as many of our

State's seasonal businesses rely on the busy summer season and fall season to pay their major bills for the year, including their mortgage and property taxes, not to mention their all-important employees.

Two weeks ago, a Maine innkeeper in York County told me that her inn would normally have a 94-percent occupancy rate at this point in the summer. She currently has an occupancy rate of 6 percent.

As one observer put it, the word "Vacationland," which appears on our license plates in Maine, might well be replaced with "Vacancy Land."

I have heard from so many hotel owners throughout Maine, and their stories all have a familiar theme: Reservations made months ago for July and August are being canceled, and cancellations for the fall are also starting to come in. In addition to putting hotel staff at risk of losing their jobs, or having their hours cut drastically, or not being hired in the first place, the vendors that supply these establishments are losing sales. Local retailers and restaurants are losing summer customers. Planned improvements and expansions are being postponed, causing harm for local tradespeople.

I talked to a restaurant owner who operates a wonderful restaurant in Portland. Right now, she has to depend on outside seating and lives in fear of a bad storm, where people won't be able to eat outside. Only slowly is Maine allowing in-restaurant eating to resume in the most populous parts of our State. All of us understand that we have to put the health of people first, but these restaurant owners are getting desperate, and they are trying very hard to comply with all the CDC regulations.

There is no doubt that similar disruptions are occurring across the country. That is why it is so important that we reach bipartisan agreement to allow those small businesses that have been especially hard hit by the pandemic to receive an additional forgivable loan. As we continue our bipartisan negotiations on such a plan, I have come to the floor to outline some of my own priorities for a second Paycheck Protection Program loan.

First, I do believe that we will achieve bipartisan agreement to allow the hardest hit small business employers—those who have seen their revenues decline by 50 percent or more in any quarter this year compared to the same quarter last year—to receive an additional PPP loan. This is absolutely essential to the ability of these businesses to survive as the fight against COVID-19 continues.

Second, because we must stretch the \$130 billion that remains in the PPP funds as far as we possibly can, I support generally limiting eligibility to entities that have 300, rather than 500 or fewer, employees with a special provision for seasonal employers.

Third, I believe that we need to expand forgivable PPP expenses in some

commonsense ways. For example, we should allow forgiveness for supplier costs and investments in facility modifications and personal protective equipment that employers are buying to protect their employees and their customers, such as plexiglass shields, patio installations for outdoor dining, masks, gloves—that kind of equipment. It is especially important to restaurants facing dining restrictions and those struggling to get the high-quality food supply that they need. We should also clarify that employer-provided group health benefits are included in forgivable payroll costs.

Fourth, we should extend the PPP to small 501(c)(6) organizations that are not lobby organizations. I am talking about local chambers of commerce, business leagues, economic development associations, and boards of trade, which are doing a great job but are struggling to themselves survive.

Fifth, we should clarify in statute that forgivable loan funds can be spent through December 31 and allow borrowers to apply for loan forgiveness, at the time of their choosing, after 8 weeks from loan origination.

Finally, to ensure transparency in the PPP loan program, we should require the Small Business Administration to comply with data and information requests from the Government Accountability Office or Federal inspectors general within 15 days.

There are many other ideas that the four of us who are members of the Small Business Task Force are taking a look at, but today, I just wanted to outline for my colleagues some ideas that I am particularly interested in including in this bill.

As the shutdowns have grown longer, it has become clear that millions of small employers need additional help if they are to keep their heads above water and survive. It also has been clear that many of these employers must make substantial investments to modify their operations, to protect their employees and customers, to mitigate the spread of the COVID virus.

Most of all, we need to always keep in mind that we are talking about employees. It is the small businesses of our country that employ the majority of the people who are working.

We are close to reaching a bipartisan agreement, and I know we are going to be working very hard over the recess to do so. I also know that, for small businesses that are struggling, such an agreement cannot come soon enough.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues—Senator MARCO RUBIO, Senator BEN CARDIN, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN—for their dedication and good-faith efforts to reach an agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I came before the Chamber yesterday and made the case as to why Congress needs to begin negotiations on another

COVID-19 emergency supplemental bill and to do it now. The needs are real. They are immediate. In fact, when the House passed the Heroes Act, we should have begun those negotiations in the first week after it had passed it, but we didn't. We should have begun the negotiations in the second week after it had passed it, but we didn't. We should have begun the negotiations in the third week after it had passed it, but we didn't—and the fourth and the fifth and the sixth.

Every day, I talk with Vermonters, sometimes hundreds at a time in statewide conference calls. From small businesses, to families, to schools, to hospitals, to Federal employees, I hear their urgent needs. So I want to talk today about just one of those urgent needs—funding for the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS.

It plays an important role in our Nation's immigration system. It processes requests for immigration benefits, American citizenship, and it screens asylum seekers. The agency is staffed by more than 19,000 dedicated men and women across the country, including roughly 1,700 in my home State of Vermont.

Last Friday, furlough notices were sent out to 13,350 of the 19,000 USCIS employees. They are effective next month, on August 3. That is just 4 weeks from now. In Vermont, 1,111 men and women received this notice, which is over 65 percent of the USCIS workforce in Vermont. These are men and women who, day after day, do important work for the Nation. They have continued to do that work every day even during the COVID-19 pandemic.

And they have been told, even though they have been doing the work loyally and effectively, after August 3, a month from now, they can no longer do their job; they will no longer receive a paycheck.

Nationwide these are 13,350 new and urgent reasons why the Senate must act on our Nation's real and immediate needs, and the Senate majority must make that possible now. We have lost 6 weeks since the House acted on this. It is time the Senate acts.

I have been ringing the alarm bells for more than a month on this issue. We know that due to declining revenue, immigration-related application fees coming into USCIS, the agency is facing a budget shortfall of \$1.2 billion, and the furlough notices that were suddenly sent out last week are the result of this shortfall. USCIS is simply saying they can't pay employees with revenues they do not have.

I would remind everybody the shortfall is not entirely due to COVID-19. The agency has not lived within its budget for the last 3 years of this administration, and, frankly, the Trump administration's mismanagement and extreme immigration policies have only worsened the situation.

As part of the President's efforts to erase our identity as a nation of immigrants, he has not just tried to shut

our Nation's doors to asylum seekers and refugees, he has attempted to restrict almost all immigration to this country.

He has created obstacles for immigrant workers, created a wealth test for immigrants, even exploited the current public health emergency to impose additional immigration restrictions that have nothing to do with public health.

And because USCIS has not been able to issue visas or process other immigration benefits as they normally do as a result of President Trump's anti-immigrant policies, revenue, of course, has fallen.

No matter the cause, the budget shortfall is real. We have to address it. Furloughs would not only disrupt the processing of immigration benefits and American citizenship and other critical services provided by USCIS, but it is going to cause unnecessary hardships on thousands of Federal employees and Federal contractors. It is going to come at a time when our Nation is already dealing with record job losses.

The loss of these valuable jobs will also cause hardship to the communities across the Nation where these Federal workers live and work. These are communities already struggling with the pandemic. They were dealing with people who have skills that have been built up over years of experience.

So let's craft a fair, responsible solution to this problem. That would require emergency appropriations and accompanying legislation to ensure transparency and accountability.

Time is of the essence. I know, as vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, we have agreement on the vast majority of the possible appropriations bills. There has been a concern by the Republican majority not to bring them up because they do not want something on COVID.

Well, every Senator can go home and talk to their people in their State. They will hear, as I do every single day in my calls from Vermonters, there is a need to do something regarding COVID.

Now, there have been numerous calls by myself and the Democratic leadership in the Senate, and despite those calls, the White House and the Republican majority have refused to move forward on a fourth COVID-19 emergency appropriations bill where we could address this and other critical issues caused by the coronavirus pandemic.

We should not wait any longer. In fact, we must not wait any longer. I call on Majority Leader McConnell to begin bipartisan negotiations on a COVID-19 emergency relief bill now so we can solve this problem before furloughs are necessary.

The Senate is about to recess for 2 weeks, but that doesn't mean our work stops. With millions of people working from home due to the coronavirus, including in the U.S. Senate, we have shown that we can do our job from wherever we are located.

I know, on the major COVID bill, my staff and I worked 7 days a week, sometimes very late into the night, and we are all in separate locations, but we got it done, and we got an appropriations bill through here that almost all Republicans and Democrats voted for because people worked together. We worked together. We passed legislation this country needed.

We showed it can be done, so we can and we should begin bipartisan, bicameral negotiations. Do it during the next 2 weeks so that when the Senate is back in session, we have legislation to consider and debate. We can enact the bill into law expeditiously.

If there are amendments people want or things they want to change, vote them up or vote them down. We should be willing to stand here and vote, and then we can enact a bill into law and do it expeditiously.

The American people deserve no less. The dedicated men and women at USCIS deserve no less, but I would say the men and women of every single one of our States deserve no less.

There are 100 of us here. We have shown we can work together. We have done it before. We have done it with appropriations bills. We sat here, voted for or against amendments, and then did what is best for the country. Let's do it. Let's not be afraid to vote.

I see my distinguished friend from Texas on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I thank my friend from Vermont for his courtesy.

Yesterday, Texas reported almost 7,000 new coronavirus cases, setting a new single-day record.

As cases have climbed in recent weeks, it has become clear that we need to take what we have learned about this virus and adjust our strategy.

In the beginning, we were still learning about this novel virus and how it is transmitted, while also trying to maximize scarce resources. I think the best analogy I can think of—we were trying to design and build an airplane while we were flying it.

Because of that, only individuals with symptoms or who had been in contact with a person who had tested positive could be tested themselves, but we know a lot has changed in the last few months. We have learned that individuals can have the virus even if they aren't showing symptoms.

Recent studies in North Carolina and New York have shown that somewhere between 12 and 20 percent of people could have the COVID-19 antibodies. In other words, they have had the virus, and they recovered, but they didn't even know they were sick in the first place, but the problem is they can still spread it to others.

As our knowledge about the coronavirus has increased, so have our testing capacities, but I think it is im-

portant to take stock of where we are and to see how we need to adjust further to, again, what we have learned by hard experience.

On Sunday, I traveled to Dallas, TX, with Vice President MIKE PENCE for a briefing on the coronavirus response efforts, and we were joined by two of those members—Dr. Deborah Birx and HUD Secretary Dr. Ben Carson.

On the flight down, I was able to spend some time talking with Dr. Birx about testing strategies and the ways we can more effectively identify positive cases and stop the spread, especially among asymptomatic individuals who have no incentive, no motivation to request a test in the first place. If I am feeling well, why would I go ask for a coronavirus test unless I am just curious. That is the conundrum.

Dr. Birx talked about the concept of pool testing, which is one of the most efficient ways to test large numbers of people using the least amount of time and resources.

Let's say, for example, that a number of employees at a meat packing plant are tested simultaneously. Rather than running each sample individually to see if any of the employees had the virus, you would pool the sample together and run it as a group. If the pool sample comes back negative, you know that each individual within that pool is negative. And if it comes back positive, each sample is run individually to identify positive cases.

But this is a way to magnify the number of testing cases we can do by maybe as much as a factor of 10.

This pool-testing model makes it much easier to conduct repeated tests for individuals in a single setting such as workplaces, schools, or nursing homes.

This is exactly the kind of strategy we are going to need as we contemplate sending our children back to school.

Dr. Birx was recently quoted as saying: "If you look around the globe, the way people are doing a million tests or 10 million tests is they're doing pooling."

So as we are seeing spikes in Texas and a number of other States across the country, it is clear we need to adapt to everything we have learned and embrace a new and different strategy. We need more efficient and effective ways to test broad swaths of people so we can identify positive cases as soon as possible.

Now, we know this virus is particularly deadly if you are over 80 years old or if you have underlying health problems. For the rest of us, honestly, if you get symptoms, you are probably going to recover. Sadly, some will have to be hospitalized, but, actually, the level of fatalities we have seen from the coronavirus infection have remained remarkably low because our healthcare providers have discovered new treatments and new ways to save lives.

A data scientist and associate professor at Cornell University named

Peter Frazier has said about pool testing that “if you don’t test people without symptoms and focus only on symptomatic people, then you miss the epidemic and continue spreading.”

We need to constantly reevaluate and adapt our strategy to ensure that we are identifying cases as soon as possible to stop the spread and to protect the most vulnerable among us.

I know the administration and the task force are working around the clock on this, but to be frank, we need to up our game, and I hope we will focus on developing a comprehensive testing strategy based on what we have learned from this hard experience to combat the rise in cases and community spread we are seeing in places like Texas and elsewhere.

S. 4049

Madam President, this week, the Senate is fulfilling one of our most basic responsibilities—and that is to support our common defense.

Passing the strong, strategic, and bipartisan national defense authorization bill is something we have done for the last 60 years. It is how this body has ensured that generations of servicemembers would be paid, that they would have the equipment and training they need, as well as the weapons, the planes, and the ships to bring them home safely. It is how we have taken stock of the evolving threat landscape and made adjustments to ensure that our military remains the very best in the world. It is a belief in peace through strength.

We know our adversaries are constantly watching us to see whether we are hesitant or pulling back from our world leadership or maybe we are not investing like they are in modern weapons systems that can defeat our defenses.

Well, we know for all the technologies and innovation that have made our lives simpler and more efficient, that these changes in technology have made safeguarding our national security that much more challenging.

We are seeing new technologies on the battlefield, and the race to develop next-generation weapons, such as hypersonic missiles, has allowed our competitors to get a few steps ahead of us. The bottom line is, unless we continue our investment and our determination to remain No. 1, we are going to be losing ground against our adversaries. We no longer enjoy the across-the-board strategic edge that we used to have, and it is time for us to take bold action to reverse the tide before it is too late. That is what I believe we can achieve with this year’s National Defense Authorization bill.

I appreciate Chairman INHOFE and the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which operates almost entirely on a bipartisan basis. It really is a great tradition and one we don’t want to break, passing the Defense authorization bill each year.

It also provides funding to both modernize and grow our aging fleet, so we

can send our troops around the world with the confidence that they have the best equipment available.

I’m glad this legislation includes a provision I offered to increase the number of new F-35 aircraft. When we talk about providing our servicemembers with the best possible equipment, the F-35 is a prime example. This 5th generation fighter gives our servicemembers an edge in stealth, surveillance, and weapons systems.

Growing our F-35 fleet has been a priority for a number of years, and this legislation will continue moving us in the right direction. These aircraft will be made by hardworking Texans in Fort Worth, and provide our servicemembers around the world with the most advanced and capable aircraft to see them through their missions.

But maintaining a competitive edge requires much more than a fleet of top of the line aircraft or a stockpile of innovative weapons. It also requires end to end security in our supply chains.

The COVID-19 pandemic has really shone a light on the vulnerabilities that come from a reliance on other countries for critical manufacturing. We lean heavily on China and other countries for masks, gloves, gowns, ventilators—all the equipment we’ve needed over the past few months. That reliance has led to a shortage of these supplies at the most critical time, and forced our medical workers to go into battle without their traditional armor.

It’s been a wake-up call on supply chain vulnerabilities, and a reminder that we need to keep our most critical supply chains right here at home. One area where we need improvement is with 5G. For all the rewards that come with this advanced technology, there are also a lot of risks, and we need to ensure we’re protecting this critical asset. That’s why Senators BURR, WARNER, and I introduced the Secure 5G and Beyond Act, which is now law.

It requires the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation telecom systems, and help our allies protect their systems as well. But I believe we need to take this a step further, and safeguard not only the networks themselves but the supply chains that produce them. The reality is, a lack of domestic industry has caused the U.S. to fall behind our foreign adversaries in developing 5G technologies.

I’m glad the NDAA includes an amendment I offered to support these critical supply chains. It would give the Department of Defense the flexibility to partner with industry for commercial development and deployment of 5G technologies. This will ensure we’re investing in American companies to strengthen and secure our critical networks, which are vital not only to our national security, but to our everyday lives.

Beyond supporting 5G, another critical supply chain we need to support is for semiconductors.

These devices are everywhere—they’re the underlying technology in

everything from our cell phones, to computers, to cell towers, to missile defense systems. Despite the pervasiveness of these devices in our everyday lives, we’re largely relying on other countries to manufacture them. Since 2000, the U.S. has dropped from producing roughly a quarter of the world’s semiconductors to only 12 percent.

Meanwhile, China has gone from manufacturing zero chips to 16 percent of the world’s supply, and plans to invest another \$1.4 trillion in semiconductor technologies. America has lost ground to global competitors, and unless the U.S. takes action, it’s estimated that by 2030, 83 percent of global semiconductor manufacturing capacity will be in Asia. We need to bring back some of the talent that was first created here in the U.S.

Of course, that’s much easier said than done. Building a new foundry is a very expensive undertaking, and it’s going to require an investment from the federal government.

That’s why Senator WARNER and I introduced the CHIPS for America Act, and I hope we can include a version of this bill as an amendment to the NDAA. This would create a federal incentive program through the Department of Commerce to encourage semiconductor manufacturing in the U.S.

In short, this would help stimulate domestic advanced semiconductor manufacturing, and boost both our national security and global competitiveness.

I mentioned, these devices are everywhere—military systems, telecommunications, healthcare, agriculture, manufacturing. Virtually every industry stands to benefit from a more secure semiconductor supply chain and our economy would reap the benefits of bringing these manufacturing jobs back to the United States.

This legislation would serve as a boon to both our national security and our economy, and I’m hoping it will be included as part of the NDAA.

I’d like to once again thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for upholding the now 60-year tradition of a bipartisan process to get this legislation over the finish line on time. I’m glad this legislation prioritizes advancements in the critical technologies that will modernize our national defense, and restore our competitive edge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first of all, I would make a comment in reaction to the comments of our good friend from Texas. What he says is true, and the American people are not aware—and I don’t say this critically of the previous administration—but during the Obama administration, his top priority was not really defense. He had his own agenda, and, consequently, we suffered at that time.

In the last 5 years, which would have been from 2010 to 2015, he reduced the

funding of our military by 25 percent. What people don't realize is, during that same timeframe, Russia increased theirs by 34 percent, and China increased the funding of their military by 83 percent. That put us in a situation in which we have to do what we are doing, and that is why this and the last bills have been very important.

We are still working on the National Defense Authorization Act. I consider it to be the most important bill of the year. I know my colleagues agree with me that this is very significant, and this is something that we know is eventually going to pass. This will be the 60th consecutive year.

Our military is the best in the world. This week, with this bill, we are going to make sure it stays that way. The goal of having a strong military is deterrence—to make sure that we don't have to use it—and to send a signal to our enemies that they can't win against us. This is the message we need to send today, tomorrow, and forever. That is what the national defense strategy tells us.

I don't have the national defense strategy book here, but we have been adhering to it. It is a strategy that was put together a few years ago by 12 Democrats, 12 Republicans, and all the experts in the field, and we have been using it as our model ever since. So we want to make sure that we have enough ships and planes and everything in place.

China and Russia have caught up in some areas, and I think it is important, as the Senator from Texas said about the hypersonic weapons, that we are talking about offensive and defensive weapons; we are talking about something that is state of the art. They actually are ahead of us right now, but with this bill we are going to get caught up.

Our superiority rests on our staying ahead of our competition. We ceded that advantage under the last administration, and we are going to correct that. That is where we are right now.

I see the minority leader is here, and I would like to propose a unanimous consent request.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENTS
EN BLOC

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, the following amendments be made pending en bloc and the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed without intervening action or debate: Paul amendment No. 2011; Sanders amendment No. 1790; third, Cornyn-Schumer-Cotton amendment No. 2244.

I further ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc and the Senate vote on adoption of the amendments en bloc with no intervening action or debate.

I hesitate to do this. It will take me a minute to actually name all of the amendments because it is important

for our Members who are watching to be aware of where they stand in line.

I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc and the Senate vote on adoption of the amendments en bloc with no intervening action or debate: Moran, No. 1694; Hyde-Smith, No. 1881; Romney, No. 1883; Portman, No. 1891; Kennedy, No. 1987; Romney, No. 2018; Sullivan, No. 2391; Johnson, No. 2077; Wicker, No. 2178; Fischer, No. 2231; Risch, No. 2238; Gardner, No. 2241; Portman, No. 2243; Inhofe-Reed, No. 2248; Peters, No. 1753; Warner, No. 1803; Coons, No. 1808; Warner, No. 1907; Tester, No. 1968; Bennet, No. 1977; Smith, No. 2058; Cortez Masto, No. 2186; King, No. 2215; Merkley, No. 2251; Cantwell, No. 2255; Cantwell, No. 2256; Hirono, No. 2269; Menendez, No. 2270, and Peters, No. 2275.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, while I know the committee is working hard and I know the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Rhode Island are working hard together in a very good way, I know they have been trying to work up an agreement on three amendments to come, as well as a managers' package, but there are certain amendments that our side feels should be debated.

In a moment I will ask the chairman to modify his request to include reasonable numbers of amendments that we believe should have rollcall votes. None of these are "gotcha" amendments. None of these are extraneous. They are not dealing with impeachment or the records of the President or anything like that. Every one of them is related to the NDAA bill, and there is sincere feeling on our side that these amendments should be debated and voted on.

This is not an attempt to block or obstruct; this is an attempt to come together. As we know, to make this work, we need bipartisan agreement. All of them, as I said, are related to the NDAA bill.

The modification I am asking for also includes the two Republican amendments, one from Senator CORNYN and one from Senator PAUL.

I appreciate the chairman's desire to start voting on these amendments, but I hope he will modify his request so that several more Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle can amend the bill as well, and we can move forward.

So I ask this question of my friend the chairman: Will the Senator modify his request to include the following amendments to be called up and voted on in relation to Sanders No. 1788, in lieu of Sanders amendment No. 1790—that is the 10 percent cut to the Pentagon; Tester No. 1972 on Agent Orange; Shaheen No. 1729 on the PFAS study; Gillibrand No. 1755 on transgender policy; Manchin No. 2361 on NNSA; Menendez No. 2396 on the Bounty Act; Van Hollen-Rubio No. 1845

on the DETER Act; and Schatz-Murkowski No. 2252 on the section 1033 program?

I ask the Senator to modify his request to add those amendments, and then Members on our side who have serious concerns can have their amendments considered.

Mr. INHOFE. First of all, let me respond by saying that this has been a long process, and it is one that has involved leadership on both sides, and we are attempting to do that. I think that by looking at the list I have read off, the Senator will see a lot of Democrats and a lot of Republicans there. For that reason I think we have an adequate number that several of us have agreed on, so I would object to modification of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, I hope we can continue these discussions in a productive and fruitful way, but at this point I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

RUSSIA

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to speak about the disturbing reporting regarding Russian efforts to harm Americans in Afghanistan through payments to the Taliban and the Haqqani network. This is deadly serious and we—the Congress and the American public—must get answers to a number of questions.

When did the United States first receive information suggesting that Russia was providing financial support to Taliban or HQN operatives to kill American troops?

What investigation has been done by DOD or intel agencies to corroborate the charge?

What investigations have been done into the deaths of U.S. troops in Afghanistan during the relevant time period to determine whether they might be linked to Russian payments?

Was information about this allegation contained in the President's daily briefing in late February? If so, why are the President and the White House maintaining so strongly that the President was never briefed?

When did the United States first brief allies—specifically, the United Kingdom—on the intelligence concerning the Russian bounty allegations?

What events led to an administrative interagency meeting on this topic in late March?

What options were explored at that meeting? Were any undertaken?

To the extent that there is a difference of opinion about the existence of such a program among U.S. agencies, what explains the differing conclusions?

Did President Trump discuss the matter in any of the numerous phone

calls he had with Russian President Putin from late March through this month?

If the President knew of the concern, why did he persist in trying to get Russia invited as a participant to the G7 meeting to be held in the United States this fall?

Why hasn't the President condemned the existence of any such program or at least pledged that there would be serious consequences if such a program existed?

That Russia might behave in a hostile manner toward U.S. troops in Afghanistan would not be a surprise based upon Russia's track record of bad behavior all over the globe, but what has been surprising has been the administration's actions regarding this explosive allegation, and I believe the Senate must get to the bottom of it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, since last week, the Senate—ostensibly one of the great deliberative bodies in the world—supposedly has been “debating” the \$740 billion National Defense Authorization Act. It has been a very, very silent debate because of the 700 amendments that have been filed to this bill. There have been no rollcall votes on any of them. I do understand that in the managers' amendment, some of the noncontroversial, non-significant amendments have been accepted and absorbed, and that is fine. We have had a vigorous debate, but nobody in the world has heard that debate because there has not been one amendment here on the floor.

Knowing the way the Senate does business, I worry very much—and I hope I am wrong, and I will do my best to prevent it, but I worry very much that we are supposed to be getting out of here for the Fourth of July break tomorrow night. Right now, it is a little after 2 p.m. on Wednesday, and we are out of here on Thursday.

Given the fact that we are talking about 53 percent of the discretionary budget of the U.S.A., I am just a little bit worried about how many real amendments, significant amendments, are going to be offered.

Let us be clear that over the last year, we have been part of what I consider to be the biggest do-nothing Senate in the modern history of this country. This country faces enormous crises in terms of the pandemic, faces enormous crises in terms of an economic meltdown, enormous crises in terms of racial injustice and police brutality, enormous crises in terms of being the

only major country on Earth not to guarantee healthcare to all people as a human right, and enormous crises that in Siberia last week, the temperature was 100 degrees, which is frightening the scientific community because they understand this is the tip of the iceberg regarding climate change. We have all these crises out there, and nothing much happens here in the Senate.

Well, I think maybe it might be a good idea to start some real debate right here. I have introduced six amendments that are significant. I will discuss each of them. Other Members, Democrats and Republicans, have also introduced significant amendments.

Given the fact we have done virtually nothing over the last year, I think it is not inappropriate to have some serious debate on one of the very major pieces of legislation we will be dealing with.

We are talking about a bill that will spend some \$740 billion. That is more money in terms of military spending than the next 11 nations combined. Does anybody have a problem with that? Some of us do. Maybe others don't. Let's debate it.

We are talking about a bill that will be spending more money on the Pentagon than we did during the height of the Cold War and the height of the wars in Vietnam and Korea. Does anyone have a problem with that? Well, I do. Maybe some other people do. Maybe you don't. Tell me why you think we should be spending more money on the military today in terms of inflation than we did during the war in Vietnam. Let's debate it.

We are talking about a bill that will provide 53 percent of the entire discretionary budget to the bloat and wasteful Pentagon at a time when the Defense Department cannot even pass an independent audit. We have a huge budget for the Pentagon. They cannot pass an independent audit, and the response of the Senate is, well, let's give them even more money. It may make sense to some people. It doesn't make sense to me.

In my view, it would be rather disgraceful for us to leave town, recess the Senate for 2 weeks without getting a vote on a single amendment and then come back in a couple of weeks to pass a \$740 billion Defense bill without any opportunity to amend that bill.

If the horrific pandemic that we are now experiencing, where tens of thousands of people are coming down with the virus every single day—if the pandemic has taught us anything, it is that national security, the well-being of our people, and protecting our people is a lot more than just building bombs and missiles and jet fighters and tanks and submarines. Our people are in trouble today in an unprecedented way with the pandemic and with an economic meltdown in which tens of millions of people have lost their jobs over the last couple of months. We have to focus on how we protect those people. It is not just spending money on planes and guns and bombs.

In order to begin the process of addressing some of the most important issues facing our country, I have introduced five amendments, all of which I think are important and all of which I believe need to have a vote and a debate. Let me very briefly explain what those amendments are and what they would do.

The first amendment would reduce the military budget by 10 percent and use that \$74 billion in savings to invest in distressed communities in every State in this country that have been ravaged by extreme poverty, mass incarceration, deindustrialization, and decades of neglect.

It is no secret to anybody that the American people are hurting all across this country. We have communities where unemployment today is 20, 25, 30 percent, where people are sleeping out on the streets, where schools are underfunded, where decent-quality childcare is virtually not available, and where air and water pollution is rampant. It is time that we stop turning our backs on those communities.

What we are doing right now is focusing attention on the fact that 40 million Americans are living in poverty. Half of our people are living paycheck to paycheck. And maybe—just maybe—instead of investing more money in nuclear weapons and submarines and God knows what else, maybe we want to invest in our own people, in jobs and healthcare and education, so that they can live their lives with dignity and security.

I believe right now, in the midst of all of the crises this country faces—the crisis of the pandemic, the crisis of the economic meltdown, the crisis of racial injustice, the crisis of 100 million people being uninsured or underinsured, the crisis of climate change—I think the American people want real transformation. They are tired of the status quo. They want a government that represents all of us, not the 1 percent and wealthy campaign contributors.

I do understand that the people behind this military budget who love it so much are the military-industrial complex and the defense contractors. They are doing phenomenally well. It is a great budget for them. Their CEOs make tens of millions of dollars a year. They make huge profits every single year. It is a good budget for them. But maybe we may want to get our priorities right and have a good budget for working families and low-income families in America. That is what my amendment does.

This amendment is being cosponsored by Senators MARKEY and WARREN. It is also being supported by over 60 organizations throughout this country representing millions and millions of people, including organizations like Public Citizen, Union of Concerned Scientists, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and the Coalition on Human Needs. These organizations are saying that maybe—just maybe—instead of investing in weapons of destruction, instead

of spending more money on the military than the next 11 nations combined, maybe we should invest in our people.

What this amendment would do is provide funding, again, for 1,000 distressed communities, from Vermont to Oklahoma, which would receive Federal funding to hire more public school teachers, provide nutritious meals to children and parents, and offer free tuition to public colleges, universities, or trade schools.

At this pivotal moment in American history, we have to make a fundamental decision that we want to continue spending billions on endless wars in the Middle East, on weapons of mass destruction—of which we have more than enough—or do we provide decent jobs and education and healthcare for millions of people in our country?

Further, a major reason why there is so much waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon is, in fact, that the Defense Department remains the only Federal agency in America that hasn't been able to pass an independent audit, which deals with the second amendment that I have introduced.

I don't think it is too much to say that the largest agency of the Federal Government has to pass an independent audit.

There is nobody in the Senate who does not believe there is massive waste and fraud at the Pentagon. Defense contractor after defense contractor has pled guilty to fraud. We have massive cost overruns.

In the second amendment that I am offering, which has been cosponsored by Senator GRASSLEY, a longtime Republican leader here; Senator LEE, a Republican from Utah; and Senator WYDEN, of Oregon, all that we are asking is that there be an independent audit of the Defense Department and that it be completed no later than fiscal year 2025. It is not a very radical idea.

The third amendment I am offering is one that, I would hope and expect, would have wide support right here. I think it does have support among the American people, and it certainly has widespread support among the medical community and the epidemiologists of this country.

Just yesterday, I was participating in a hearing of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. We had the leading experts in this country, including several representatives of the Trump administration—Dr. Fauci and others—talking about the pandemic and what we could do about it. There was widespread consensus. Nobody, I think, has any doubt anymore, except maybe Donald Trump, that masks are a very, very important preventive measure. They are not going to solve all of the problems, but the evidence is overwhelming that the people who wear masks in public, when they are around other people, are less likely to transmit the virus or to receive the virus. Nobody doubts that anymore.

So the question that we have to ask ourselves is this: How does it happen that, in the wealthiest country in the history of the world and with the strongest economy in the world, we have doctors and nurses today who are dealing with people with COVID-19 and don't even have the personal protective equipment that they need? How in God's name does that happen?

We are spending 18 percent of our GDP on healthcare—twice as much as any other country. Yet we cannot provide a \$1 mask to a doctor or to a nurse whose life is at stake. It is not only doctors and nurses.

What a number of countries around the world are doing, which is very smart, is producing or acquiring large numbers of high-quality masks, and they are distributing those masks to all of the households in their countries. We should be making sure that every household in this country has the masks that each needs. That will save lives. There is an estimate from the University of Washington that it could save 30,000 lives during this pandemic if 95 percent of the American people were to wear masks. It would also save us a substantial sum of money because it is a lot cheaper to invest in masks than in the hospitalizations for those who have the virus. I should mention that other countries that are not as wealthy as we are—countries like South Korea, France, Turkey, Austria, and others—are doing just that.

Again, this is an idea that has won support from not only Dr. Fauci but from other leading healthcare experts who testified before the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions yesterday. That is the third amendment—making sure that we utilize the Defense Production Act to produce the masks that our medical professionals and the American people need. We can save tens of thousands of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars by doing it.

The fourth amendment I have filed would prohibit funding for military aid and logistical support for the disastrous, Saudi-led war in Yemen. I believe it is past time that we put an end to our unconstitutional and unauthorized participation in this war.

On this issue, I am certainly not alone. A bipartisan majority of the U.S. Senate has already voted three times—not once, not twice, but three times—to halt all U.S. military support for the Saudi-led war in Yemen. It is time for us to do that again—this time, not just in words but in action. We should have no money going toward U.S. participation in this horrible war, which is destroying a nation with some of the poorest, most desperate people on Earth.

So that is the fourth amendment, and I think it would be hard for anybody here to deny that it is an important amendment. This has already been, in one form or another, passed three times. So let's get some teeth into it.

The last amendment that I have filed would reduce the defense budget by one-tenth of 1 percent—not a lot of money—and use that money to make our Nation safer by reaching out to people throughout the world and expanding educational and cultural exchange programs.

In other words, the theory behind this whole bill is that, by spending \$740 billion on the building of planes and tanks and guns and the most sophisticated weapons of mass destruction in the history of the world, it will make us safer. Well, I am not so sure. Maybe what makes us safer is when we break down the fears and the hatred that exist between peoples all over the world. Maybe what makes us safer is when we get to know each other—that is, as human beings—whether we are Chinese or Russians or Iranians or Brazilians or Canadians. Maybe we all share the same human aspirations.

Throughout history, it has always been easy to demonize people you don't know—always easy. That is what demagogues have always done. We are fearful of Jews, of Blacks, of the Irish, of Italians, and of gay people. It is so easy to demonize people with whom we are not comfortable and don't know. They are not in our communities, and we don't know anybody. Let's demonize the people of Iran, and let's demonize the people of China and Russia.

This is not saying that I or anybody else here is in agreement with their policies, but are weapons the only approach we have toward them? Yes, we need a strong military, and I believe in a strong military. Do you know what I also believe? When we have kids from the United States who go to other countries and when other countries send their kids, their farmers, their doctors, their nurses to America and when we get to know each other, we have a shot at breaking down the irrational hatred which fomented so many problems throughout the world.

As a former mayor, I can tell you—and I am not alone—that this idea of sister cities is certainly not a radical idea. I suspect that almost everybody here in the Senate comes from a State in which a sister city program exists or that you have programs with cities in other countries. In Vermont, we have a number of them. I started several of them when I was the mayor of Burlington. It was a beautiful thing to see—kids from another country coming to our country and our people going to other countries and learning.

All I am asking for is one-tenth of 1 percent—\$7 billion—no, less than that. What am I talking about? All I am asking for is \$700 million to encourage cultural and educational exchange programs. By taking this tiny fraction from our defense budget—one-tenth of 1 percent—and applying it to these exchange programs, we will send a message about the critical role these exchange programs play. They exist all over this country already, but I want to see them grow, in supporting not

only American security but our common, global security. Therefore, I have listed and described five amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up the following amendments en bloc: Senate amendment Nos. 1788, 1920, 1789, 1919, and 1918; that they be reported by number; further, that there be 2 hours of debate on the amendments, equally divided and controlled by me or by my designee and by Senator INHOFE or his designee; and that, following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the adoption of the amendments, in the order listed, without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I object; although, I would like to have the opportunity to look at all five of these amendments to see which ones would not be consistent with the negotiation that is taking place right now.

I would like to make sure that everyone understands that, at this very moment, Democrats and Republicans are looking at a lot of amendments, as we have done every year for 60 years, to make sure that we are getting the right amendments in order to make the bill the best we can.

Now, it will just take a few minutes for me to do this. Until then, I reserve the right to object. If we have a timing problem on this, I will object, but it might be that there is one I would like to consider at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to be recognized in order to make a comment.

First of all, I have great respect for the Senator. I have worked with him many times, and we have really gotten quite a bit accomplished. I know that my friend is sincere in the statements that he makes, but I find myself in a different position.

I see what has happened in previous administrations, and, during the last 5 years of the Obama administration, I saw when, in his budget, the President reduced the military by 25 percent at the same time that China was increasing its by 83 percent and Russia was increasing its by 34 percent. I am sensitive to this, and it is one of the considerations we make.

I do object to this amendment, but I am going to work with the Senator to see which of these might be appropriate and can be sellable to a majority of the people in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, Senator INHOFE is right. He and I have

known each other for years and, I think, respect each other. We have very, very different philosophical leanings, but that does not mean we cannot respect each other.

All I would say to my friend from Oklahoma is that the function of the Senate is for 100 Members to determine what is important, not just a few. What may not be important to me may be important to you, and what may be important to you may not be important to me. Yet I think, especially on a bill of this significance, the Members—Democrats and Republicans—have a right to come forward and bring forth amendments. If I don't like an amendment and you have brought forth the amendment, it is likely I am going to vote against it, and you are going to vote against my amendment. I get it. It is called democracy. It is the process we go through here. I just cannot understand why we are not voting on amendments. When we get back, I would rather see a process take place whereby dozens of amendments are brought up and debated and voted up or voted down. That is what, I think, this Senate is supposed to stand for.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield for one more comment so I may address that, Senator REED and I are both in agreement. We have been wanting amendments. We have been asking on a daily basis—now for about 2 months—for Members to bring their amendments down so we can consider amendments. We are in the process now of seeing which amendments we are able to bring up that we might have reached an agreement on. We are doing that. It is not an easy process, and it does take a little bit of time. Yet I am hopeful that we will have amendments. I anticipate we will.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if I may respond to my friend, JACK REED is a good friend of mine, and I know that you and he are working hard and well together. Yet you are two Senators, and there are 98 others of us, and on what you two may agree to be important or not to be important others may disagree.

All I am saying to the Senator is to let people bring up their amendments. If the Senator doesn't like it and I don't like it, we will vote against it. I just don't know why we are restricting amendments in a Senate which is supposed to be one of the great deliberative bodies in the world. The world is supposed to look at us, but they are not looking well at us when a few people determine what is going to be voted on or not.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would respond by saying that I don't take issue with that, but I will say that we all remember what happened a year ago when this bill was up. One of our Members objected to all amendments coming up, and, as a result, no one got an amendment up.

That isn't happening this year because the individuals who were opposed to amendments last year are no longer

opposed to amendments. We are just trying to—with the understanding and the realization that things are done in the Senate with unanimous consent and that one person has a lot of power to stop a lot of other people, we don't want that to happen. We want to encourage amendments, and we are going to try to consider as many as we can.

Mr. SANDERS. I would simply say to my friend, he is quite right—unanimous consent gives every Member a lot of power, and I do not want to be objectionable, but I feel very strongly on this issue, and I hope we can work on something.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you.

Mr. SANDERS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

S. 4049

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to continue this debate about the Armed Services bill we are considering on the floor today, and I would just note for my colleagues that I know that it is a general practice, but my colleague from Vermont is bringing up a very big, important point about amendments, and that is that the NDAA is marked up in a secret, closed-door session. It is not like we all have a bright light, and we know what is in there. In fact, they held the language for 3 weeks and then now, all of a sudden, thrust it onto the Senate floor and then don't want us to offer any amendments.

In my case, I am objecting, along with the Senator from Vermont, as to a major shift in policy that is in this proposal that shifts money away from the Department of Energy and onto nuclear weapons, where we didn't even vote on it. We didn't vote on it, and members of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee are in disagreement about this, the fact that we weren't consulted and that it is basically raiding jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter signed by myself, Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, Senator HEINRICH, Senator CASSIDY, Senator WYDEN, Senator BARRASSO, Senator RISCH, and Senator SANDERS from Vermont.

We object. We are members of the committee. We are very senior members of the committee. We understand the DOE budget. We understand the DOE responsibilities. We don't think it is right for somebody to mark up, in a closed-door session, in the middle of the National Defense Act, a taking of money, basically neutering the Secretary of Energy, basically saying: You only have half of your budget because we are going to dictate over at the Department of Defense exactly how you are going to spend those dollars.

So that is a big power grab by a very few people and certainly deserves a vote by the U.S. Senate. It certainly deserves a bright light by the American people because not only are we talking about this from the perspective of the taking away DOE resources and

focus from the Secretary of Energy, we are also talking about putting into the hands of the Department of Defense what has been civilian oversight—civilian oversight of the production of our nuclear weapons.

So why is this so important, who is in charge of DOE's budget? Well, I think the Secretary of Energy is. I think he comes before Congress. I think he discusses with Congress what that budget is. I think he talks and we talk and we review his nominees and the work they do on this.

For me, in the State of Washington, we have the largest nuclear cleanup site in the entire world. So cleaning up Hanford from the plutonium production that was done for our efforts in World War II is a massive, multibillion-dollar-a-year cleanup. I wish it wasn't that much, but it is, and it has been for decades.

And people constantly look at that \$2 billion and think: We can shave some of those dollars off. I am here to tell you, you can't, not with leaky tanks leaking into the groundwater and moving toward the Columbia River—no. We cannot have people taking half of the DOE budget and then basically deciding that the Department of Defense is going to decide what to do with it.

Hanford isn't the only site. There are other cleanup sites—Paducah. There are still things to do with Savannah River. There are cleanup sites all over the United States.

To, in the NDAA bill, basically, preclude us from even discussing such a major policy change that is not supported by the Secretary of Energy, not supported by the chairwoman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee or the ranking member, Senator MANCHIN, whose amendment we would like to seek a vote on—so I submit to the RECORD this letter from my colleagues on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee also objecting to this language.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, July 1, 2020.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM INHOFE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. JACK REED,
Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, CHAIRMAN INHOFE, AND RANKING MEMBER REED: As the Senate considers the Fiscal Year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), we write to express our opposition to the inclusion of controversial and far reaching provisions that would fundamentally alter the Department of Energy's (DOE) responsibilities for the nuclear weapons budget.

As members of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, we write in support of Secretary Brouillette's June 29,

2020 letter to Chairman Inhofe and share his concerns that provisions in the Senate NDAA bill undermine DOE's ability to meet its mission goals and responsibility for maintaining the viability of the nation's nuclear deterrent.

As currently written, the Senate NDAA bill would strip the Secretary of Energy of the ability to manage some of the most sensitive national security programs that account for almost half of the Department's budget. Such changes could impede accountability and Congressional oversight, as well as imperil future funding for other critical DOE responsibilities such as promoting scientific and technological innovation, managing our National Laboratories, sponsoring basic research in the physical sciences, and ensuring cleanup of the nation's nuclear weapons complex.

Sweeping changes impacting civilian control of our nation's nuclear weapons programs should only be made in consultation and coordination with the committee of jurisdiction in an open and transparent manner. The changes included in the Senate NDAA bill have been met with opposition from the Trump Administration, former Secretaries of Energy, recent NNSA Administrators, and the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise.

We therefore request that the provisions be removed from the pending bill or that the Senate be allowed to vote on the relevant amendments filed by Ranking Member Manchin.

Sincerely,

MARIA CANTWELL, MARTIN HEINRICH, RON WYDEN, MAZIE K. HIRONO, BERNIE SANDERS, LAMAR ALEXANDER, BILL CASSIDY, JOHN BARRASSO, JAMES RISCH.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, what else is at stake?

Also, at stake are our National Laboratories. Our National Laboratories do incredibly hard work for us. I know what ours does in the Pacific Northwest because they are an expert on cybersecurity. They are an expert on detection. They are an expert on terrorism and fighting terrorism.

So now, all of a sudden, you are going to let the National Nuclear Security Agency decide what that budget looks like because they are going to take more money from it.

Now is not the time to allow the Department of Defense, without our oversight that we are sent here to give, to decide what this budget should look like. That is not their role and responsibility.

So the fact that somebody thinks they can stick this in, in a closed-door session, and then jam us, without a vote of this body to consider such a major policy change, is appalling.

Now, I know that people tried to do this 2 years ago or a year and a half ago and basically got taken out by the House of Representatives, but that is no excuse for doing it now. People jam so many things into this bill. Last time, they jammed in basically the relicensing of a hydroelectric dam. Basically, written into this for the chairman was the revision that said they no longer have to be regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Well, I can tell you, there are lots of people in the State of Washington who

would probably love to know that the hydro system didn't have to go through FERC relicensing, but they did have to go through FERC relicensing.

And so the fact that that was in a panoply of things stuffed into NDAA, in the final negotiation in the House, they couldn't get it out. So we are being held hostage one more time on the NDAA bill for bad policy that has not had the broad discussion of the U.S. Senate.

So I would say to my colleagues: If you care about nuclear waste cleanup, if you care about the agenda of our national laboratories—and I will tell you, you think people are threatening you right now? People are threatening us on cybersecurity. People don't stick a sub into your waters anymore, taunting you or flying aircraft overhead; they basically put software tools into your powerplants, into your military sites. We need our National Laboratories to do their job, not have the money subverted by some agency that we don't see, they don't come to us—they go to a few Members. They go to the Senator from Oklahoma, but they don't come see us and talk about their agenda. They basically just want an increase, and instead of going through the normal legislative process, they basically are trying to short circuit both appropriators and authorizers on this important issue.

So if people are proud of that language, if they think it stands, they think it is the right policy, then they should let us have a vote. They should let us have a discussion of who is in charge of DOE's budget because, I guarantee you, most Americans think it is the Secretary of Energy and not a five-, seven-member subcommittee level over at DOD.

This is appalling, and it has to stop.

TRIBUTE TO JOEL CONNELLY

Mr. President, if I could, while I am out here on the floor, pay tribute to one of the most iconic newspapers in the State of Washington, the Seattle P-I, and one of its noted journalists who is retiring this week after 47 years writing for the organization.

This newspaper, which was part of the Northwest history for decades, finally stopped the print edition several years ago, but it has still been online. Joel Connelly has been an icon of the Northwest, writing about Presidents for decades; writing about Northwest policy, such as the outdoors; writing about the relationship, on international issues, particularly with Canada.

Joel said it best. Once he said about his employer, the P-I: "We do our best to inform you, to intrigue you, amuse you, and at times get under your skin."

I miss those days of journalism today, where someone has so much knowledge and information about our region, about politics in general, about society that they help keep us informed and engaged.

Joel once interviewed Bill Clinton on Air Force One and obviously interviewed many Presidents—both Bushes, Clinton, Obama.

He once was a Pulitzer Prize runner-up for his coverage of the Washington Public Power Supply System, and obviously he covered Hanford issues, which I just talked about many times, and many northern border issues.

He probably was best known in his coverage of Idaho Governor Cecil Andrus and wrote a book about him and the many fights that happened in the Northwest on land issues for many, many years.

So I can't even begin to explain what it will be like without Joel Connelly at the helm of political national commentary for us in the Pacific Northwest.

Nobody sharper. Nobody keener. Nobody more experienced. Nobody who struck more fear in me when I had to get on the phone with him because chances were he knew the issue even better than I did, and I had been pretty studied on it, but that is what you get after 47 years in journalism.

So I wish him all the best, but I also hope his retirement is a call for all of us to remember how important journalism really is; that the tool and trade of people who basically cover these policies, understand them, and help give commentary in their columns or in their journalism and oversight is what helps us keep our democracy here in the United States.

So, Joel, I know you will be up there on Whidbey Island and you will be watching us from afar. I know we are not done hearing the last of you, but I know we have heard a great commentary for 47 years of the P-I and your comments, and we greatly appreciate it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the United States, Mexico, and Canada launched a new chapter in our historic partnership with entry into force of the U.S.-Mexico-Canada agreement—USMCA for short.

Thanks to the decisive leadership of President Trump, the USMCA will open the door for robust economic growth.

At the same time, regarding his decisive leadership as President, this isn't an issue just now. This is something the President said in 2016; that the NAFTA was the worst trade agreement that we have had, and he was going to get rid of it or revise it. Most Presidents run on a platform. They may not serve on that platform. This President is serving on that platform, and today the USMCA going into force for the first time is absolute proof of this President keeping his promises and getting the job done.

He also needs to compliment and thank Ambassador Lighthizer, the negotiator on this whole agreement.

The USMCA brings to bear, then, a trilateral trade agreement that will lift prosperity across North America. The USMCA paves the way for freer markets and fairer trade. It replaces NAFTA and puts America in a better position to expand market access for U.S. workers, farmers, and businesses.

Specifically, the USMCA modernizes rules of origin for autos, sanitary and phytosanitary standards, intellectual property rules, digital trade, financial services, customs, labor, environment, and more.

Some of these issues I just mentioned weren't even around 30 years ago when NAFTA was negotiated. Modernizing NAFTA into the 21st century was the right thing to do.

As we enter into this agreement, the world is navigating uncertain times, as we know. The unprecedented public health crisis has turned the economy upside down. Now, more than ever, our farmers, businesses, and workers need and deserve certainty that they can count on us to turn things around and accelerate economic recovery.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, with jurisdiction over trade, I will be keeping a close eye on the implementation of this historic trade agreement. I want to ensure that any kinks that come up are ironed out with appropriate flexibility, taking into consideration unforeseen circumstances from the pandemic, such as automakers and others who were shut down or repurposed operations to produce medical equipment, and that is just one example. I also will keep watch to hold accountable all stakeholders and ensure full compliance with the trade agreement.

Now more than ever, North America must work together to harvest the fruits of the USMCA. That is how we can foster investment, innovation, and job creation for the 478 million people who live in these 3 countries.

The U.S. International Trade Commission estimated that the USMCA within 5 years would raise U.S. GDP by \$68 billion, forecasting 176,000 new jobs in the United States. That is music to the ears for everyone in America who has been hard hit by the pandemic's economic fallout.

Farmers in my State have enjoyed one of the best planting seasons in decades. However, our livestock, poultry, and biofuels producers have faced catastrophic disruption to their operations since the virus swept across the country. Iowa is the Nation's No. 1 producer of pork, eggs, and corn. Our economy depends on exports to grow and for our economy to flourish.

American farmers depend on exports to pay their bills and earn a living. Farmers simply want to grow and produce for the marketplace, not for government bailouts.

Today's inauguration of the USMCA offers a bright ray of hope for North America to plow forward and to plant the seeds for a robust economic recovery.

With every trade issue that comes, it is always important to remember what President Kennedy said in his Presidency about trade legislation and the benefits of it—that if it benefits one country, it benefits the others. He said that “a rising tide lifts all boats.”

I am confident the USMCA will steer America's workers, farmers, and businesses to better days ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

NATIONAL BORINQUENEERS DAY

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and honor a very important group of people in our Nation's history. The 65th Infantry Regiment of the U.S. Army known as the Borinqueneers was comprised of U.S. citizens from Puerto Rico.

The Borinqueneers courageously fought for decades to defend the freedoms we enjoy today. They answered the Nation's call to serve, and they are the longest standing and only Active-Duty Latino military unit in U.S. history.

On April 13, 2016, Congress awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment in recognition of the Borinqueneers' numerous contributions to American history and outstanding military service from World War I to the recent conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Today, I am honored to join my colleagues in recognizing the bravery, service, and sacrifice of the Puerto Rican soldiers of the 65th Infantry Regiment and to express deep gratitude for the contributions to the Armed Forces that have been made by hundreds of thousands of patriotic U.S. citizens from Puerto Rico.

I am honored to designate April 13 as National Borinqueneers Day to ensure their legacy lives on. History will forever pay tribute to the sacrifices these individuals and their families made to defend our freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in Spanish.

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

(The English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. It is my honor to recognize the service of these brave American citizens from Puerto Rico who fought for our Nation. Your legacy will live on. Thank you for your service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 641, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 641) designating April 13, 2020, as “National Borinqueneers Day”.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be

agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 641) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Continued

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. 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. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and to speak as in morning business.

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

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, Americans are demanding an end to the persistent racial injustice and violence that inflicts our country.

Protestors have gathered outside of the White House and the Capitol. New Mexicans from our biggest city to our smallest communities are marching for meaningful change.

I have joined these protests in Emancipation Hall, in the streets of Washington, DC, and now I am joining them from the U.S. Senate floor.

The systemic racism being called out is real, and it is all around us all of the time. Within law enforcement, we have seen it in the horrific videos documenting the racist violence that took the lives of Black men and women at the hands of police officers and extrajudicial killers.

As a father raising two sons, my heart aches for the parents whose sons' and daughters' names we now chant loudly in the streets.

It is unacceptable for any American to live in fear of violent encounters when they enter public spaces or retail stores or just go out for a walk. The very fact that painful experiences with law enforcement are ubiquitous among so many in our Nation should be evidence enough that our current model of policing is not working. That is why I am proud to support my colleagues Senator BOOKER and Senator HARRIS to cosponsor the Justice in Policing Act.

This sweeping legislation reforms the police system as Americans across the country demand an end to police violence that is disproportionately targeting communities of color. It would address qualified immunity standards in Federal law which currently stand in the way of police officers being held accountable in court when they violate constitutional rights.

It would improve transparency in police departments by creating a national police misconduct registry, requiring accurate data reporting on misconduct and use-of-force incidents and ensuring problematic officers cannot avoid accountability by simply changing departments.

It would also institute a real national ban on choke holds and other deadly, restrictive airway holds. We have seen this use of lethal force kill George Floyd and Eric Garner before him and earlier this year, in Las Cruces, NM, when a police officer killed Antonio Valenzuela with a vascular neck restraint. While I hope that justice will be served for Mr. Floyd's and Mr. Valenzuela's families, I know that these men should never have died in the first place. This lethal and unnecessary type of force should not be allowed anywhere in America.

The Justice in Policing Act would put an end to the injudicious use of no-knock warrants that led to the murder of Breonna Taylor in Louisville, KY.

In order to prevent future extrajudicial killings like the murder of Ahmaud Arbery earlier this year by vigilantes in Georgia, the Justice in Policing Act would also finally designate lynching as a Federal crime.

The legislation would also make broad improvements in training for police officers. That includes implicit bias training to confront the prejudice that contributes to racial profiling and confrontational treatment of people of color.

We must also make deescalation and crisis intervention techniques standard operating procedures in encounters and make the use of lethal force the absolute last resort.

In my State, we have seen far too many incidents in which police have killed people of color with lethal tactics or responded to New Mexicans experiencing mental illness or addiction with unnecessary force that resulted in death. Nearly a decade ago, the Department of Justice began an investigation into the Albuquerque Police Department after numerous such fatal police encounters.

In 2014, the Department of Justice released its report that cited chronic abuses of civil rights, widespread community distrust, and a pattern of excessive force across the department. For these past 6 years, the Albuquerque Police Department has been under a federally enforced consent decree that has brought much needed changes in hiring, training, and use-of-force policies.

This ongoing process of changing just this one police department's culture is far from complete. Court hearings continue, and a federally appointed monitor continues to oversee the yearslong process of completing all of the reforms in the federally mandated, court-approved settlement agreement.

We have still seen multiple fatal police shootings each year since reforms began. That includes one case from just

this March in which the response to a welfare check on Valente Acosta-Bustillos, a man with documented behavioral health challenges, ended with officers fatally shooting him after he wielded a shovel that he had been using to do yard work.

This is not an isolated incident. The evidence is everywhere that systemic reform is needed for law enforcement, not just in Albuquerque but all across my State and all across this country.

Since the beginning of 2015, since the Nation reeled over the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO, there have been more than 5,000—5,000—fatal police shootings. It pains me to say that in that time period, New Mexico has had the highest rate of these shootings in the entire country on a per capita basis.

While our overall nationwide statistics on deaths in police custody are incomplete—which is a problem in and of itself—the data we do have makes it clear that police in the United States are killing people at a rate much higher than our peer nations.

A review of media-reported, arrest-related deaths in the Bureau of Justice Statistics found that more than 1,300 people died in police custody in the 10 months from June 2015 to March 2016. During that same period, only 13 people in the United Kingdom died in or after being in police custody.

While we are a much larger country, even on a per capita basis, that means that Americans are being killed at a rate of approximately six times higher than in the UK. Many, if not most, of these deaths fall or are deemed "justified" by law enforcement, but I want to say in the strongest possible terms: We can't keep accepting a system that justifies this level of deadly violence.

The House of Representatives demonstrated last week that we can take action to address this system. Answering the calls of Americans all across our country, the House voted to pass the Justice in Policing Act. The Senate needs to do the same because no one should be above the law—no one, including those in law enforcement.

While I believe these last weeks and months of Americans calling for justice have changed many hearts and minds, I am not naive enough to believe the current administration is either willing or capable of bringing the level of change that Americans are demanding.

Unfortunately, in the last 3½ years, President Trump and his Justice Department have either turned a blind eye, excused, or even openly encouraged a more violent police culture.

Starting under Attorney General Jeff Sessions and certainly continuing under Attorney General Bill Barr today, this administration has spent much more time and Department of Justice resources aiding the President's own political battles and implementing even harsher penalties on Americans than on holding police departments accountable for guaranteeing equal justice under the law.

None of this excuses us in the U.S. Senate from our own responsibility to lead. We have a moral obligation, as Senators, to grapple with how we can bring about necessary Federal changes with better Federal policies. That should start with passing the accountability measures, the meaningful improvements to police training, and the bans on excessive lethal force tactics that are in the Justice in Policing Act.

We also need to encourage the changes that will necessarily need to come at the local government level. Advocates are calling on local governments to reassess their budgets and how much they have prioritized policing and prisons over education and housing. They are also calling on their local leaders to reimagine a world where armed police officers are not the responders dispatched to all crisis situations.

Last week, the mayor of Albuquerque, Tim Keller, announced a proposal to create an entirely new public safety department that would dispatch social workers, housing and homelessness specialists, and violence prevention and diversion program experts instead of police officers to homelessness, so-called down-and-out calls, and behavioral health crises.

This is the scale of systemic change that we need to be thinking about and devoting real resources toward implementing in all of our communities. We all need to carefully assess the effectiveness of continuing a status quo in law enforcement that is clearly not keeping all of us safe.

It will not be easy to dismantle the “us versus them” warrior mentality that is so pervasive in far too many of our law enforcement agencies. If you treat the communities that you police like they are war zones, you create a relationship that dehumanizes the very people you are charged to protect, and you fuel more of the very violence and crime that you are supposed to prevent.

Our streets in American communities should never be treated like battlefields. Our local law enforcement officers should not be armed with military-grade equipment or AR-15s or MRAP armored vehicles. They should not be meeting peaceful protesters or demonstrators with teargas, flash grenades, or rubber bullets. Police officers should not be treating any of us—whatever our race and regardless of the reason we are encountering them—as if we are enemy combatants.

This militarized version of policing is simply not the way to keep the peace or create a sense of public safety in our communities. It has created a distrust in police and perpetuated trauma and inequities in communities across our country.

I believe that we must transform this dangerous warrior mentality into a guardian and neighborhood support mentality that looks to serve all members of our communities. We should remember that police officers are supposed to be officers of the peace.

Now, I want to be careful to emphasize that the responsibility for changing this mentality must not fall entirely on the shoulders of our law enforcement officers because we also recognize that our law enforcement officers, too, are being impacted and harmed by this broken system. We, as a society, have asked them to treat the symptoms and respond to the deficiencies that all of us have allowed to persist in education, in healthcare, in addiction treatment, and in housing.

On a daily basis, police officers address the most acute impacts of our not solving those other issues. I would argue that this is because the same wrongheaded “us versus them” warrior mentality that I have been describing has long resided within this very institution and has been baked into our country as a whole.

It is the same warrior mentality that has fueled the Federal Government’s ineffective and racist War on Drugs and War on Crime over the course of the last 50 years. Intentionally or not, these policies helped build what advocates label the “school-to-prison pipeline” and the “New Jim Crow.” “New Jim Crow” may sound harsh, but in my estimation, it is an astonishingly accurate way to describe the unequal society we have created across our entire country.

More than half a century since the marchers in the civil rights movement called on us to create an America where we were all judged by the content of our character rather than the color of our skin, we find ourselves facing the same challenges as 50 years ago, with implicit bias and structural inequities ravaging our communities of color. That is what you get after combining militarized policing with overly harsh sentencing laws, mass incarceration, private prisons, continued institutional racial discrimination, and a decades-long disinvestment in public education, affordable housing, food assistance, addiction treatment, and healthcare resources.

That is the system we are talking about when we talk about systemic racism. It will take more than nice words and kind wishes in a fleeting period of weeks to dismantle that system that has been built up in the 400 years since the first slaves were brought to our shores and in the last 50 years of rapidly growing mass incarceration. The sooner we finally recognize this, the sooner we can try to envision and implement effective, comprehensive reforms on the scale necessary to create institutions that look out for all of us.

Over the last months, as we have all confronted the health and economic crises brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic, I have often heard that we need to get back to normal. But that version of normal was not working for all of us.

Rather than hoping to get back to that unequal and unjust normal of before, I would offer this challenge to all of us. We have an opportunity—an opportunity to rebuild our country in the

months and years ahead. Let’s rebuild our country to create an America that includes all of us. Let’s rebuild our country in a way that respects the human dignity of Black lives and provides safety and opportunity to all of us. Let’s rebuild America to become the place we all want it to be: a nation where we see each other as fellow human beings, equally deserving of life and liberty.

There is still so much more hard work ahead of us. Passing the Justice in Policing Act is a first meaningful step on a long path forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FREE SPEECH

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, over the past few months, we have all watched the power that the digital community has to make someone’s passing thought go viral and the power that the digital mob has to make controversial voices completely disappear.

Well, who is the “digital mob” exactly, because right now we are hearing a lot about mob rule. Sometimes it is hard to tell who the mob actually is. Is it the millions of users who swarm social media platforms at the very first hint of a controversy, or is it the professional activists who provoke many of these attacks? They seem to know just when to pitch a thought, a word, or an idea. Could it be the platforms themselves that cave to the pressure and police speech when they don’t agree with that speech?

So let’s drill down on this just a little bit. Today I want to focus on the Googles and the Facebooks of the world because, when it comes down to it, they are the ones that are in the driver’s seat. They are the ones that end up calling the shots.

For years, tech companies have waged a very public war against platform users who speak out against the popular narrative, and the executives charged with defending these calls routinely struggle to explain the arbitrary nature of their content-moderation policies.

Every time moderators remove a post for what is called shocking content or cause a moral panic by placing a warning label on satire, Big Tech asks us to just, oh, write it off: It was a mistake. We really didn’t mean to do it. Move on.

But we haven’t moved on because the platforms themselves have provided plenty of evidence to confirm that Big Tech’s employees bring their bias to the workplace. Bear in mind, all of these employees who are developing the search models—the algorithms that are prioritizing your search, that are mining your data, that are policing

your speech—are bringing their bias and their prejudice to the workplace.

These fears were confirmed back in 2017 when the New York Times reported that a Twitter employee intentionally—intentionally—deleted President Trump's account, not because of any violation but because the employee had an ax to grind. They did not like President Donald Trump.

This May, the Wall Street Journal revealed that Facebook set up a multistep approval process for changes to its "integrity ranking initiative" due to "reasonable concerns that overzealous engineers might let their politics influence the platform."

Think about that. Facebook set up a multistep approval process for changes to its integrity ranking initiative due to reasonable concerns that overzealous engineers might let their politics influence the platform. Do you think? Of course they were. Of course they were. The problem: They have been doing it all along and trying to say it is just your imagination when, actually, it is not.

I don't think anyone anticipated that digital platforms would become powerful enough to act as judge and jury over what information Americans should be allowed to access online. Congress certainly didn't anticipate it when drafting legislation to keep those companies in check. But they have overstepped their bounds. They continue to misbehave until we come along and slap their hand, and then they try to act as if they are going to solve their problems, which leads us to our current debate over section 230 reform.

Big Tech relies on section 230 of the Communications Decency Act to shield themselves from content-based litigation. The statute also acts as a sword that platforms can engage to remove content they judge to be obscene, violent, harassing, or otherwise objectionable.

In the section 230 world, then, the users—the users—are responsible for what they post, not the platform that hosts the content.

The platforms, however, have the right to set their own content guidelines within limits without being sued. That sounds reasonable. Section 230 is important, specifically, because of what it doesn't do. It does not force companies to choose between moderating every piece of content they host and letting their websites turn into the Wild West.

But, as I said, no legislation could have anticipated our current digital landscape. Big Tech companies like Google and Facebook now have the power to ruin content creators who step out of line. And it is their line. Even if those creators manage to stay on the right side of the moderators, they know their online presence—and many times this is also their livelihood—lives or dies at the hands of employees given the near-impossible task of remaining completely neutral 100

percent of the time. The dynamic between users and platforms has changed. And now, Congress must change the law that guides that dynamic.

Here is the problem. This country has become so polarized, I am not sure Big Tech understands what a healthy dynamic would actually look like. No longer do their choices seem to make sense to many Americans. The compulsion to flag and report and threaten has become a reflex. When the digital mob chooses to attack on any given day, then, their choices are going to change with every news cycle. As we have seen, this heavily influences how Big Tech chooses to police content on their platforms.

You may have been saying or posting something for years—no problem. But then one day, that digital mob—because of the news cycle—will choose to attack you.

Conservatives have suffered under this mob rule. There is no denying it. There is no denying that there is a digital mob. But reform can happen without overextending the heavy hand of Federal regulation over the entire tech industry. As someone who knows what it feels like to be censored, I get it. I absolutely understand why we need these reforms and why Congress needs to act now, this year. But I also know that the more you rely on threats to motivate good corporate behavior, the more likely you will be to find reasons to follow through on them.

We must find stronger ways to rein in tech firms seeking to become the new speech police. We know for a fact that Big Tech's biases are the problem. But when did more government become the solution? We already tried that approach. We called it the fairness doctrine. Guess what. It did not work. Instead of encouraging free and fair discourse, powerful parties use those rigid standards as leverage to control speech.

And, I will tell you, I can think of few things more dangerous than allowing lawmakers and bureaucrats to weaponize the full force of the Federal Government against the private exchange of information.

What we do know is this. Big Tech's era of self-regulation is over. It no longer works. Big Tech is not a group of infant companies. They are referred to as Big Tech because they have grown.

This self-regulation is over. It is time for Congress to take an action. But punitive, one-size-fits-all standards will put these tech companies in a straitjacket. It would hamper innovation, and, eventually, it would collapse the industry.

Instead, we should set up and give Big Tech guidance that will encourage growth and will encourage innovation, while also making it abundantly clear that Congress will not allow Big Tech's political bias to determine what information Americans are allowed to access online. We will not allow Big Tech and their political bias to determine

how information is prioritized through your search engine. We are not going to allow Big Tech and their political bias to data-mine every email, every text, and every search, and then use that to access your information online.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the previously referenced articles from the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal.

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

[Nov. 2, 2017]

ROGUE TWITTER EMPLOYEE BRIEFLY SHUTS
DOWN TRUMP'S ACCOUNT
(By Maggie Astor)

This is the way the world ends: not with a bang but a deleted Twitter account.

At least, so it appeared for 11 minutes Thursday evening, when visitors to President Trump's personal account, @realDonaldTrump, were informed that there was no such thing.

The error message on some devices was even more dire: "@realDonaldTrump does not exist."

Amid a presidency that has seemed, at times, to be conducted primarily in 140-character pieces, this was a seismic event—and what was left of Twitter erupted. It was a raucous, modern-day town-square gathering of the sort not seen since . . . well, since five months ago, when Mr. Trump coined a new word in the middle of the night.

It was just before 7 p.m. Thursday, and the internet was in an uproar. Time stopped. The sun rose in the west and set in the east. What, the watchers wondered, was going on? Had Twitter closed the president's account? Had a White House aide snatched the phone from Mr. Trump's tweeting hands? Had Robert Mueller chosen this moment to rifle through the president's direct messages? Had Mr. Trump himself—could it be?—decided he'd had enough of his favorite medium?

The answer, revealed three hours later, was something straight out of "Office Space." After saying in an initial statement that the account had been "inadvertently deactivated due to human error by a Twitter employee," Twitter announced that a rogue customer support worker had done it on his or her last day at the company.

Many of Mr. Trump's supporters were incensed, with some saying the incident showed a disregard for free speech. His opponents, on the other hand, were gleeful. "America: Hire this person," former Representative John Dingell of Michigan tweeted.

Even before Twitter confirmed that the deactivation had been deliberate, some were speculating about it.

In the tech world, the statement raised more questions than it answered. Twitter has never said how many employees have access to Mr. Trump's account, or described the safeguards it has in place for its highest-profile users. And the company is already under the microscope in Washington, where Congress is investigating how technology giants might have shaped the outcome of the 2016 presidential election.

Mr. Trump was locked out for just 11 minutes, and then, just as suddenly, he was back. Those watching found themselves unscathed—though some could not quite shake a sense of dread.

The president himself got back to business as if nothing had happened, tweeting at 8:05 p.m.: "Great Tax Cut rollout today. The lobbyists are storming Capital Hill, but the Republicans will hold strong and do what is

right for America!" He then fired off four more tweets, denouncing the Democratic National Committee and James B. Comey before inviting viewers to watch his interview with Laura Ingraham on Fox News.

And so, back in the offices and homes of the nation, the people of Twitter could only sit back and reflect.

For better or for worse, the world seemed predictable again, and one user made his prediction bold. "Man," Alex Zalben wrote, "in like nine months there's gonna be a ton of Trump Twitter blackout babies."

[May 26, 2020]

FACEBOOK EXECUTIVES SHUT DOWN EFFORTS TO MAKE THE SITE LESS DIVISIVE

(By Jeff Horwitz and Deepa Seetharaman)

A Facebook Inc. FB 0.35% team had a blunt message for senior executives. The company's algorithms weren't bringing people together. They were driving people apart.

"Our algorithms exploit the human brain's attraction to divisiveness," read a slide from a 2018 presentation. "If left unchecked," it warned, Facebook would feed users "more and more divisive content in an effort to gain user attention & increase time on the platform."

That presentation went to the heart of a question dogging Facebook almost since its founding: Does its platform aggravate polarization and tribal behavior?

The answer it found, in some cases, was yes.

Facebook had kicked off an internal effort to understand how its platform shaped user behavior and how the company might address potential harms. Chief Executive Mark Zuckerberg had in public and private expressed concern about "sensationalism and polarization."

But in the end, Facebook's interest was fleeting. Mr. Zuckerberg and other senior executives largely shelved the basic research, according to previously unreported internal documents and people familiar with the effort, and weakened or blocked efforts to apply its conclusions to Facebook products.

Facebook policy chief Joel Kaplan, who played a central role in vetting—proposed changes, argued at the time that efforts to make conversations on the platform more civil were "paternalistic," said people familiar with his comments.

Another concern, they and others said, was that some proposed changes would have disproportionately affected conservative users and publishers, at a time when the company faced accusations from the right of political bias.

Facebook revealed few details about the effort and has divulged little about what became of it. In 2020, the questions the effort sought to address are even more acute, as a charged presidential election looms and Facebook has been a conduit for conspiracy theories and partisan sparring about the coronavirus pandemic.

In essence, Facebook is under fire for making the world more divided. Many of its own experts appeared to agree—and to believe Facebook could mitigate many of the problems. The company chose not to.

Mr. Kaplan in a recent interview said he and other executives had approved certain changes meant to improve civic discussion. In other cases where proposals were blocked, he said, he was trying to "instill some discipline, rigor and responsibility into the process" as he vetted the effectiveness and potential unintended consequences of changes to how the platform operated.

Internally, the vetting process earned a nickname: "Eat Your Veggies."

Americans were drifting apart on fundamental societal issues well before the cre-

ation of social media, decades of Pew Research Center surveys have shown. But 60% of Americans think the country's biggest tech companies are helping further divide the country, while only 11% believe they are uniting it, according to a Gallup-Knight survey in March.

At Facebook, "There was this soul-searching period after 2016 that seemed to me this period of really sincere, 'Oh man, what if we really did mess up the world?'" said Eli Pariser, co-director of Civic Signals, a project that aims to build healthier digital spaces, and who has spoken to Facebook officials about polarization.

Mr. Pariser said that started to change after March 2018, when Facebook got in hot water after disclosing that Cambridge Analytica, the political-analytics startup, improperly obtained Facebook data about tens of millions of people. The shift has gained momentum since, he said: "The internal pendulum swung really hard to 'the media hates us no matter what we do, so let's just batten down the hatches.'"

In a sign of how far the company has moved, Mr. Zuckerberg in January said he would stand up "against those who say that new types of communities forming on social media are dividing us." People who have heard him speak privately said he argues social media bears little responsibility for polarization.

He argues the platform is in fact a guardian of free speech, even when the content is objectionable—a position that drove Facebook's decision not to fact-check political advertising ahead of the 2020 election.

INTEGRITY TEAMS

Facebook launched its research on divisive content and behavior at a moment when it was grappling with whether its mission to "connect the world" was good for society.

Fixing the polarization problem would be difficult, requiring Facebook to rethink some of its core products. Most notably, the project forced Facebook to consider how it prioritized "user engagement"—a metric involving time spent, likes, shares and comments that for years had been the lodestar of its system.

Championed by Chris Cox, Facebook's chief product officer at the time and a top deputy to Mr. Zuckerberg, the work was carried out over much of 2017 and 2018 by engineers and researchers assigned to a cross-jurisdictional task force dubbed "Common Ground" and employees in newly created "Integrity Teams" embedded around the company.

Even before the teams' 2017 creation, Facebook researchers had found signs of trouble. A 2016 presentation that names as author a Facebook researcher and sociologist, Monica Lee, found extremist content thriving in more than one-third of large German political groups on the platform. Swamped with racist, conspiracy-minded and pro-Russian content, the groups were disproportionately influenced by a subset of hyperactive users, the presentation notes. Most of them were private or secret.

The high number of extremist groups was concerning, the presentation says. Worse was Facebook's realization that its algorithms were responsible for their growth. The 2016 presentation states that "64% of all extremist group joins are due to our recommendation tools" and that most of the activity came from the platform's "Groups You Should Join" and "Discover" algorithms: "Our recommendation systems grow the problem."

Ms. Lee, who remains at Facebook, didn't respond to inquiries. Facebook declined to respond to questions about how it addressed the problem in the presentation, which other

employees said weren't unique to Germany or the Groups product. In a presentation at an international security conference in February, Mr. Zuckerberg said the company tries not to recommend groups that break its rules or are polarizing.

"We've learned a lot since 2016 and are not the same company today," a Facebook spokeswoman said. "We've built a robust integrity team, strengthened our policies and practices to limit harmful content, and used research to understand our platform's impact on society so we continue to improve." Facebook in February announced \$2 million in funding for independent research proposals on polarization.

The Common Ground team sought to tackle the polarization problem directly, said people familiar with the team. Data scientists involved with the effort found some interest groups—often hobby-based groups with no explicit ideological alignment—brought people from different backgrounds together constructively. Other groups appeared to incubate impulses to fight, spread falsehoods or demonize a population of outsiders.

In keeping with Facebook's commitment to neutrality, the teams decided Facebook shouldn't police people's opinions, stop conflict on the platform, or prevent people from forming communities. The vilification of one's opponents was the problem, according to one internal document from the team.

"We're explicitly not going to build products that attempt to change people's beliefs," one 2018 document states. "We're focused on products that increase empathy, understanding, and humanization of the 'other side.'"

HOT-BUTTON ISSUES

One proposal sought to salvage conversations in groups derailed by hot-button issues, according to the people familiar with the team and internal documents. If two members of a Facebook group devoted to parenting fought about vaccinations, the moderators could establish a temporary subgroup to host the argument or limit the frequency of posting on the topic to avoid a public flame war.

Another idea, documents show, was to tweak recommendation algorithms to suggest a wider range of Facebook groups than people would ordinarily encounter.

Building these features and combating polarization might come at a cost of lower engagement, the Common Ground team warned in a mid-2018 document, describing some of its own proposals as "antigrowth" and requiring Facebook to "take a moral stance."

Taking action would require Facebook to form partnerships with academics and non-profits to give credibility to changes affecting public conversation, the document says. This was becoming difficult as the company slogged through controversies after the 2016 presidential election.

"People don't trust us," said a presentation created in the summer of 2018.

The engineers and data scientists on Facebook's Integrity Teams—chief among them, scientists who worked on newsfeed, the stream of posts and photos that greet users when they visit Facebook—arrived at the polarization problem indirectly, according to people familiar with the teams. Asked to combat fake news, spam, clickbait and inauthentic users, the employees looked for ways to diminish the reach of such ills. One early discovery: Bad behavior came disproportionately from a small pool of hyperpartisan users.

A second finding in the U.S. saw a larger infrastructure of accounts and publishers on the far right than on the far left. Outside observers were documenting the same phenomenon. The gap meant even seemingly

apolitical actions such as reducing the spread of clickbait headlines—along the lines of “You Won’t Believe What Happened Next”—affected conservative speech more than liberal content in aggregate.

That was a tough sell to Mr. Kaplan, said people who heard him discuss Common Ground and Integrity proposals. A former deputy chief of staff to George W. Bush, Mr. Kaplan became more involved in content-ranking decisions after 2016 allegations Facebook had suppressed trending news stories from conservative outlets. An internal review didn’t substantiate the claims of bias, Facebook’s then-general counsel Colin Stretch told Congress, but the damage to Facebook’s reputation among conservatives had been done.

Every significant new integrity-ranking initiative had to seek the approval of not just engineering managers but also representatives of the public policy, legal, marketing and public-relations departments.

Lindsey Shepard, a former Facebook product-marketing director who helped set up the Eat Your Veggies process, said it arose from what she believed were reasonable concerns that overzealous engineers might let their politics influence the platform.

“Engineers that were used to having autonomy maybe over-rotated a bit” after the 2016 election to address Facebook’s perceived flaws, she said. The meetings helped keep that in check. “At the end of the day, if we didn’t reach consensus, we’d frame up the different points of view, and then they’d be raised up to Mark.”

SCUTTLED PROJECTS

Disapproval from Mr. Kaplan’s team or Facebook’s communications department could scuttle a project, said people familiar with the effort. Negative policy-team reviews killed efforts to build a classification system for hyperpolarized content. Likewise, the Eat Your Veggies process shut down efforts to suppress clickbait about politics more than on other topics.

Initiatives that survived were often weakened. Mr. Cox wooed Carlos Gomez Uribe, former head of Netflix Inc.’s recommendation system, to lead the newsfeed Integrity Team in January 2017. Within a few months, Mr. Uribe began pushing to reduce the outside impact hyperactive users had.

Under Facebook’s engagement-based metrics, a user who likes, shares or comments on 1,500 pieces of content has more influence on the platform and its algorithms than one who interacts with just 15 posts, allowing “super-sharers” to drown out less-active users. Accounts with hyperactive engagement were far more partisan on average than normal Facebook users, and they were more likely to behave suspiciously, sometimes appearing on the platform as much as 20 hours a day and engaging in spam-like behavior. The behavior suggested some were either people working in shifts or bots.

One proposal Mr. Uribe’s team championed, called “Sparing Sharing,” would have reduced the spread of content disproportionately favored by hyperactive users, according to people familiar with it. Its effects would be heaviest on content favored by users on the far right and left. Middle-of-the-road users would gain influence.

Mr. Uribe called it “the happy face,” said some of the people. Facebook’s data scientists believed it could bolster the platform’s defenses against spam and coordinated manipulation efforts of the sort Russia undertook during the 2016 election.

Mr. Kaplan and other senior Facebook executives pushed back on the grounds it might harm a hypothetical Girl Scout troop, said people familiar with his comments. Suppose, Mr. Kaplan asked them, that the girls

became Facebook super-sharers to promote cookies? Mitigating the reach of the platform’s most dedicated users would unfairly thwart them, he said.

Mr. Kaplan in the recent interview said he didn’t remember raising the Girl Scout example but was concerned about the effect on publishers who happened to have enthusiastic followings.

The debate got kicked up to Mr. Zuckerberg, who heard out both sides in a short meeting, said people briefed on it. His response: Do it, but cut the weighting by 80%. Mr. Zuckerberg also signaled he was losing interest in the effort to recalibrate the platform in the name of social good, they said, asking that they not bring him something like that again.

Mr. Uribe left Facebook and the tech industry within the year. He declined to discuss his work at Facebook in detail but confirmed his advocacy for the Sparing Sharing proposal. He said he left Facebook because of his frustration with company executives and their narrow focus on how integrity changes would affect American politics. While proposals like his did disproportionately affect conservatives in the U.S., he said, in other countries the opposite was true.

Other projects met Sparing Sharing’s fate: weakened, not killed. Partial victories included efforts to promote news stories garnering engagement from a broad user base, not just partisans, and penalties for publishers that repeatedly shared false news or directed users to ad-choked pages.

The tug of war was resolved in part by the growing furor over the Cambridge Analytica scandal. In a September 2018 reorganization of Facebook’s newsfeed team, managers told employees the company’s priorities were shifting “away from societal good to individual value,” said people present for the discussion. If users wanted to routinely view or post hostile content about groups they didn’t like, Facebook wouldn’t suppress it if the content didn’t specifically violate the company’s rules.

Mr. Cox left the company several months later after disagreements regarding Facebook’s pivot toward private encrypted messaging. He hadn’t won most fights he had engaged in on integrity ranking and Common Ground product changes, people involved in the effort said, and his departure left the remaining staffers working on such projects without a high-level advocate.

The Common Ground team disbanded. The Integrity Teams still exist, though many senior staffers left the company or headed to Facebook’s Instagram platform.

Mr. Zuckerberg announced in 2019 that Facebook would take down content violating specific standards but where possible take a hands-off approach to policing material not clearly violating its standards.

“You can’t impose tolerance top-down,” he said in an October speech at Georgetown University. “It has to come from people opening up, sharing experiences, and developing a shared story for society that we all feel we’re a part of. That’s how we make progress together.”

END CHILD EXPLOITATION ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to thank Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman LINDSEY GRAHAM for adding the bipartisan and critically important END Exploitation Act to the EARN It Act, which is set for markup on Thursday.

This bill, which I introduced with Senator CORTEZ MASTO, would lengthen evidence preservation time in online child exploitation cases and assist law enforcement in prosecuting child pred-

ators. Once passed, the law will double the length of time we require tech firms like Facebook and Snapchat to preserve evidence and reports of online child exploitation.

In 2018, tech companies reported over 45 million—45 million—photos and videos of children being sexually abused. Unfortunately, that was double the number of reports in 2017. This legislation will give the police more time to investigate these horrific crimes. It will put child predators in jail where they belong.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3685

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today is July 1. For millions of Americans, the rent is due. Utility bills don’t stop, either. But too many New York families and too many American families will be unable to make the payments amid the pandemic that has already hurt my city and its people.

The first of the month should not be the end of the financial line for working families, and that is why we are here. We must continue to put real pressure on Leader MCCONNELL to pass the COVID 4 legislation that would include critical rent relief to families who desperately need the help.

Our working families—many of color and other minority groups—are in desperate need of this basic assistance so they can continue working, feeding their families, making ends meet. That is our push today.

Enact the Emergency Rental Assistance and Rental Market Stabilization Act—which has a \$100 billion promise to renters across the country—and the promise is real help during the real and unprecedented crisis.

Let me give you some background. The Heroes Act would authorize \$100 billion for the Emergency Rental Assistance Program led by SHERROD BROWN, the ranking member of the Banking and Housing Committee, who has just done a great job letting people know the crisis and now acting on it. What it does is it helps families and individuals pay their rent and utility bills and remain in their homes during and after the COVID-19 crisis.

The bill was already included in the House-passed and bipartisan Heroes Act, but, unfortunately, once again—as he does with so many other important issues—Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has refused to bring it to the floor, so Senator BROWN has come to ask the unanimous consent.

Without basic assistance, even those renters who are currently shielded by temporary Federal and local eviction

bans may still face eviction. Let me tell you, once someone is evicted and homeless, they regress. The kids can't go to school. Healthcare becomes even more remote. Getting to a job through public transportation is so difficult.

This actually is a stitch in time that saves nine. If people can stay in their homes because they can't pay the rent through no fault of their own, they have a better chance of reestablishing their lives and maybe even climbing up that American ladder. If they are kicked out of their homes because they can't pay the rent, through no fault of their own, it is very, very difficult. They are in a deep, deep hole.

We must, must do something for them. Senator BROWN, with his persistence and passion, has put together the right plan. We talk about numbers, sure, but behind those numbers are the faces of countless New Yorkers we see each and every day on mass transit, walking the streets, working among us. These folks are fine, hard-working people. All they want is a little dignity in their lives and ability to keep a roof over their heads. They need help now more than ever.

We need action on this now, and that is the message to our friends on the other side of the aisle.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I thank the Democratic leader.

I have a prepared speech I want to make, but I heard Senator SCHUMER talk about this. These are human beings. We in this body are Senators. We go back and forth to our States. We have the privilege of working pretty safe. We are paid. We aren't exposed to the virus all that much, mostly because we are pretty careful because we can be, and we have jobs where we can be.

Think about this. You work in a grocery store, and you are exposed to the coronavirus. A grocery store worker told me one day: They tell me I am essential, but I feel expendable because I am not very safe in this job, and they don't pay me much.

What if she gets laid off—that wouldn't happen so much in a grocery store because they are hiring—but in another job, they get laid off. They have to worry about potential eviction. Their unemployment will run out at the end of July. We have done nothing to help them.

What happens with all these people who get evicted? They end up on the streets or they go to homeless shelters that are too crowded. They go to live on their cousin's couch in the basement. What are the chances of them getting coronavirus? These are human beings in New York and Ohio and Idaho and Tennessee and all over. I can't believe we are not about to do something about this.

I thank the leader for his involvement on this issue that is so important. We are in the middle of a crisis,

unlike anything any of us have ever lived through. That goes without saying. Every single day we hear about hundreds and hundreds more Americans dying.

Back in March, South Korea had 90 cases. We had 90 cases. The capital of South Korea is 800 miles from Wuhan where this virus started. They have had fewer than 300 people die. We have had 120,000. They don't have better doctors. They don't have better public health. They don't have better medical scientists. They have better leaders than we do, obviously. Their unemployment rate is under 4 percent and fewer than 300 people have died. The people who have died are our sisters, our brothers, our parents, our friends, and neighbors.

The President of the United States and the Republican leader down the hall—who occasionally goes in and out of his office—have stopped pretending to care. They rarely talk about the coronavirus. The President rarely extends any sympathy to our brothers and our sisters and our parents and our friends and our neighbors who have been sick and who have died. It is not the President's rich friends who are dying; it is our grandparents. They are the people in nursing homes. They are disproportionately the Black and Brown workers who caught the virus on the job.

The Trump administration and Senator MCCONNELL, essentially, have just given up. We can't. We have to do our jobs. We need to show leadership where the President has failed and where the majority leader—the most powerful person in this body, the top elected official in the Senate, says: "I see no urgency." He sees no urgency because he is not out talking to people who are about to be foreclosed on or evicted from their home. Imagine being evicted in the middle of a pandemic. Imagine the fear and anxiety a family have when they are in that position.

We need to fight the health crisis and economic crisis. We can't do one without the other. Millions of Americans are in danger of being evicted and having their homes foreclosed on. The last thing we need to do is turn them out on the streets.

We have a housing crisis. Many know this. Senator MENENDEZ has joined us, who is one of the best advocates for these issues of anybody in the Senate. We knew there was a housing crisis before the coronavirus set.

We know that one-fourth of renters in this country, before the coronavirus, paid more than half of their income in housing. One thing happens in their life, just one thing. Their car breaks down. Their child gets sick. They get in a car accident, and they are out of work for a week. They get evicted. They don't have any kind of margin there.

We know that professions we are recognizing as essential don't pay enough to afford housing. We are seeing millions of people have these emergencies.

The ones they had before, many people have now. Millions have them all at once. They face impossible choices between rent and groceries, or prescriptions, or draining their savings, or going to a payday lender, and you never go to a payday lender once. You keep going back and back, and the interest you pay is more than you originally borrowed. In essence, they have no choice at all. It is not a choice between prescriptions and groceries and draining their savings. It is no choice at all. Far too often, it ends up being eviction.

In the CARES Act, we passed emergency expansion of unemployment insurance. I appreciate my friend Senator CRAPO, chairman of this committee, who supported that and so much of what is in this package. We provided funding for the most immediate needs of housing and organizations that put a temporary moratorium on evictions and foreclosures for some—not all renters and not nearly all homeowners. It is an important step but not enough.

We face two huge cliffs. This is July 1. On July 31, the \$600 a month that has kept people in their homes and kept food on their table and kept clothes on the backs of their kids—that \$600 a month ends come July 31. At the end, in many cases, the eviction moratorium ends.

The President and Leader MCCONNELL don't seem to notice. They don't seem to care. For all those renters who have been protected, back rent will suddenly be due. You may have gotten a moratorium on your rent for 3 months, but now you will owe for 4 months. The same goes for millions who aren't protected under the CARES Act but got relief from a temporary State or local moratorium or because their eviction courts were closed in many States.

With tens of millions of people filing for unemployment, the President is still refusing to lead and do something about this virus to get it under control. We know people still need help. They still need help paying the rent. They still need help making mortgage payments. They still need help protecting themselves from evictions and foreclosures. Forty percent of Black and Latinx renters report they are unlikely able to make their next payment—40 percent. It is not because they are not working hard. They got laid off and are in low-wage jobs.

That is why Senator MENENDEZ and I and Senator SCHUMER and others cosponsored and introduced—39 of my fellow colleagues—introduced the Emergency Rental Assistance Stabilization Act. It would provide \$100 billion for emergency rental assistance, including help with missed rent and utility bills. It already passed the House twice.

It is included in the Heroes Act that they passed a month ago, but it is sitting on the majority leader's desk because he doesn't seem to notice. For millions of families, the bills keep

coming and the clock keeps ticking and the stress keeps mounting.

Now a second round of layoffs are starting because this President refuses to lead and get this virus under control.

Two weeks ago, they reopened eviction courts in Columbus. They opened the Convention Center to process evictions. Think of the heartache in that building. People go to court and find out they are evicted. The judge brings down a gavel, and their lives turn upside down. Reflect on that. Tens of millions of people lose their jobs. We are not using arenas to play basketball or to play indoor soccer. We are not doing that now. We are using arenas as eviction courts.

Before this pandemic, President Trump and his wealthy Cabinet Members didn't realize or didn't care that behind the rosy stock market data this economy was already broken for millions of workers—especially for Black and Brown workers for whom it never worked to begin. Now the Trump administration—sort of like what happened with the Russians paying to kill American troops—the administration either doesn't know it or doesn't care that the bottom is falling out for these families.

Without emergency rental assistance, these families find themselves on the street with their lives turned upside down in the middle of a pandemic.

People are tired of the lack of action and lack of accountability. They are tired of being betrayed by a leader who is supposed to look out for them. They are tired of feeling like no one is on their side. We are the greatest country on the Earth, and we should act like it.

American people should not always have to fend for themselves because we have an indifferent majority leader and a President who doesn't know or doesn't care in the middle of this once-in-a-generation crisis.

It is time to step up. It is time to lead. It is time to think about what it would be like to face an eviction, knowing your two small children and you don't know where you are going to live. It is probably going to be in a homeless shelter or in a cousin's basement. You know your chances of getting infected with the coronavirus go up. Just think about those people when we make these decisions.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3685, the Emergency Rental Assistance and Rental Market Stabilization Act of 2020. I ask that the bill be considered read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

To date, Congress has appropriated nearly \$3 trillion to protect, strength-

en, and support Americans in all walks of life, to fight the COVID-19 pandemic and to stabilize the infrastructure and our economic system.

Senator BROWN and I worked on a big part of that package together on a team which was put together by Senator MCCONNELL to try to make sure we addressed, in a bipartisan fashion, the way to respond to this pandemic.

The CARES Act has been central to the effort and includes measures to help families directly, to provide aid to small businesses, to assist those in the medical field and on the frontlines of our response effort, and to stabilize our markets.

Soon after, Congress passed the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act—or CARES Act—codifying and extending these protections and providing financial relief to renters—yes, to renters.

Title IV of the CARES Act contains three housing provisions. Section 4022 imposes a 60-day eviction and foreclosure moratorium for single-family borrowers with federally backed mortgage loans. It allows struggling homeowners 1 year of loan forbearance.

Section 4023 extends similar relief to multifamily borrowers who are current on their mortgage payments. They can request up to 90-days of forbearance as long as they do not evict the tenant or charge late fees during the pandemic.

Section 4024 imposes a 120-day moratorium on evictions, fees, and penalties. That moratorium will not expire until August 31.

As with much of the CARES Act, the provisions dealing with stabilizing our economy and helping to support and sustain workers, small business owners, homeowners, and home renters are all playing out right now as we speak.

Yet the real objection here is that Senator MCCONNELL and the Republicans have said we want to work on looking at the next package of support, but we want to see how this one is playing out first and identify those places where we need to target the relief most.

The objection is that there is a desire, once again, to go rapidly into passing the House bill and not having regular order follow in the Senate as we work to approach this issue as the existing CARES Act plays out.

All of our housing agencies have extended this eviction and foreclosure moratorium and are working to help address the issues relating to tenants. HUD has expanded issuer assistance to include Pass-Through Assistance Program support, which allows servicers to apply for assistance in meeting principal and interest payments, and the FHFA has announced that no mortgage servicer will be responsible for advancing more than 4 months of missed principal and interest payments on a loan. All of these things have been done to stabilize the housing markets and to assist low-income home ownership and home construction and assistance.

While I am open to looking at the question of whether additional assist-

ance is needed for renters, homeowners, and others in our society, I am not willing to simply bypass the process in the Senate—ignore the considerations that our leadership has called for as we look to see how our current support programs are playing out—and simply jam the House bill through the Senate without having any debate or process.

This was the biggest rescue package in the history of Congress, and we included a variety of oversight mechanisms in the legislation to ensure that the dollars and programs associated with it reached their intended marks. Many of the provisions in the CARES Act and those appropriated dollars are still making their way to these individuals and families and businesses and markets across the country.

So we must work together to address these critical issues rather than simply try to jam one party's or one side of this Congress's approach to the solution without going through regular order.

I would say the arguments that are being made that we or any of us are somehow turning a blind eye to the problems that exist could not be further from the truth. As I said earlier, the reality is that we passed the largest relief program in the history of this country. We are working to provide liquidity, as well as actual dollar relief, in the amount of trillions of dollars, and those programs are still playing out.

We need to work together rather than, by unanimous consent request after unanimous consent request after unanimous consent request, try to jam down one side's approach without looking to find the cooperative solutions that I know we can.

Like I said, I am open to working on these very issues, but the way to do it is not to come to the floor with a unanimous consent request—take it or leave it. We need to let proper, regular working order operate in the Senate, and we have time to do so.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, before turning to Senators MENENDEZ, CORTEZ MASTO, WYDEN, KLOBUCHAR, REED, SCHATZ, and VAN HOLLEN, who all want to speak, I appreciate the comments from my friend—and he really is my friend—from Idaho. We work well together.

We want to do regular order. This last bill was passed in March. Then there was April, May, June. Now we are in July. It is not a question of regular order. We would love to sit down with Senator MCCONNELL and start negotiating as to what is next. We have wanted that really from about April 1. No April Fools' joke there; we really wanted to do that. Instead, Senator MCCONNELL just seemed to ignore this.

I mean, go back to the human side. What happens when somebody is unemployed? We will be leaving now for 2

weeks. That is why we are doing these unanimous consent requests now. It is because we want to see action. We have asked and asked and begged and begged and pleaded and pleaded. So what happens? We will go back home for 2 more weeks. Right now, if you can't find a job, if you are unemployed and are getting that \$600 a week, you start paying attention online or you read the papers or however you get your information, and you find out that this is going to expire at the end of July. You don't know what you are going to do, but you know that you haven't paid rent in 3 months because you have had an eviction moratorium.

Senator CRAPO talked about the moratorium. Only half of the people who pay mortgages are subject to that moratorium and are protected, and only a third of people who rent are. So, for most people, that is simply not the case.

Now that the eviction courts are open and the evictions are starting, what happens to those people? Are we just going to say: Well, let's see it play out. We know what will happen. If you don't have rental assistance, if you lose your unemployment and don't get that \$1,200 check, which is basically 1 month's rent for most people, we know what is going to happen to you. Your life is going to turn upside down. That is why we need to move. That is why we need to pass this.

I am disappointed that Senator MCCONNELL has shown no interest in doing anything on this other than just sitting tight and hoping that the money he raises from special interests—from tobacco, the gun lobby, banks, and insurance companies—can help his candidates get reelected and he can be majority leader again.

I yield the floor to Senator MENENDEZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, let me thank my colleague, the ranking Democrat—the senior Democrat—on the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, for his passion and his commitment. He has really elevated housing within the jurisdiction of the committee, which is something I am passionate about. Very often, everyone refers to the committee as the Banking Committee, but housing is a critical element of what it does. He has elevated it, and I really appreciate his passion on behalf of the millions who rent or who are fortunate enough to own homes and want to keep them to try to be able to do so.

I would just say to my distinguished chairman of the committee that I do have the highest respect for him.

Look, with the CARES package, we lumped in trillions of dollars, but overwhelmingly that money went to businesses. Of course, I support that, but it went to businesses. It went to sustain businesses. It went to ultimately help small, midsized, and even large businesses. It went to sustain sectors of our

economy like the airline industry and others.

What we are talking about goes to the very essence of what it is to have a home. "Home" is one of the most important American concepts. It is where we are taken when we are born. It is where we are nurtured while we are young. It is where we are schooled. It is where good times and bad times take place. Ultimately, it is where we build a life around our families if we are fortunate to have a home. Then, in a pandemic, we have learned that it is also a place in which to shelter.

I come to the floor today to warn of an impending storm that is brewing, and it is headed our way.

When the funds for the PPP—for the business program—ran out, we didn't have regular order to see if the PPP had been working well. No. There was a rush to put more billions in it. It was only when we said "Wait a minute, this isn't working so well for small and midsized businesses" that we made some reforms. So there was a rush then. There was no regular order.

We have a storm that is brewing and is headed our way. It will bring with it enormous financial pain. It will threaten public safety. It will make fighting the pandemic that much harder, and it will set back our Nation's economic recovery. If the Senate fails to respond to this looming crisis, Americans will needlessly suffer; families will be displaced; personal fortunes will be wiped out; and the scars will run so deep that it could take decades to heal the wounds.

As the COVID-19 pandemic took hold, the one saving grace most of us had—the one place we could take refuge to protect ourselves and our families—was our home. Our leading medical experts all urged us to stay home. If you are sick, stay home. If you have an underlying condition or are immunocompromised, stay home. If you are elderly or otherwise at risk, stay home. If you can, work from home. If you are a student, go online and learn from home. If we have learned anything from this pandemic, it is that staying home can help to contain the virus, flatten the curve, and save lives.

What if you don't have a home? As we speak, millions of our fellow Americans are asking themselves that very same question.

At a time when COVID-19 cases are spiking across the country, the provisions that we passed in the CARES Act to help renters and homeowners stay in their homes are about to run out. If we do nothing, we could face a foreclosure and eviction crisis far greater than that which we encountered during the great recession.

There is a storm on the horizon. Americans shouldn't have to fear being thrown out on the street if they miss their next rent or mortgage payments through, really, no fault of their own. They shouldn't have to fear losing their greatest personal assets or that

one safe place in the middle of a pandemic, further exposing themselves and others to the virus.

The Senate can stop this if it wants to. We can make sure that every American has a safe and healthy place to call home. That is why I joined my Democratic colleagues on the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs in introducing two bills last month that will provide assistance to homeowners and renters.

The Housing Assistance Fund, led by Senator REED, provides \$75 billion in targeted assistance to keep people in their homes while they search for new employment or a way to get back to work. This money can go toward mortgage payments or utilities or as other support to prevent eviction, delinquency, or foreclosure.

The Emergency Rental Assistance and Rental Market Stabilization Act, led by Senator BROWN, would provide \$100 billion in rental assistance to help families pay rent and help property owners maintain safe and healthy housing. It will help the economic recovery by stabilizing the rental market overall.

We also have to empower Americans to make informed financial decisions—to help them navigate the maze of lenders, landlords, government agencies—to find a sustainable path to stay in their homes.

We all know there is a housing affordability crisis in this country that jeopardizes the aspirations of millions of Americans who hope to join the middle class, and just as they have borne the brunt of the COVID-19 pandemic, low-income and minority Americans will disproportionately suffer during economic downturns.

The provisions that the chairman talked about in the law that we passed in order to help are going to be expiring. To the extent that you know about it, you might invoke it to protect yourself against an eviction or a mortgage foreclosure, but if you don't know about it and either the financial institution or your landlord looks the other way and doesn't follow the law, well then, you won't get the protection.

That is why I and 19 of my Democratic colleagues introduced a bill on Monday to provide \$700 million in housing counseling assistance. Research shows that homeowners who receive housing counseling have better outcomes than those who don't, and that evidence is overwhelming. Their risk of default goes down, and they are more likely to see their credit scores rise and their debt levels fall.

In rough times like we are in right now, these borrowers are more likely to get sustainable mortgage modifications and are less likely to end up in default. The benefits of housing counseling flow to the community at large because when a family is able to buy a home, pay their mortgage, build equity, and ultimately achieve the American dream, our towns and cities thrive. And during a pandemic, having

a safe and affordable place to live could mean the difference between life and death.

It is also especially important for senior citizens, who are more susceptible to COVID-19. So tomorrow I will introduce legislation to provide \$1.2 billion in aid for older adults living in federally assisted housing.

This bill provides additional rental assistance for senior housing, personal protective gear, and staffing to help maintain a healthy community.

So the forecasts are in. The storm is coming. The question is, What are we going to do about it?

The Fourth of July is Independence Day. It is nice to have independence from the fear that I will lose the place that I call home. That would be a tremendous gift on the Fourth of July.

Are we going to help our most vulnerable citizens during this pandemic or are we going to just watch them suffer, lose everything, and exacerbate this public health crisis?

Today is July 1. The rent is due. Mortgage payments are due. The Senate's work is due.

I remember—and I will close with this personal anecdote—when I was growing up poor in a tenement in New Jersey, the son of an itinerant carpenter and a seamstress, there wasn't always work, which meant that sometimes paying the rent was a real tough choice. And it was a choice of paying the rent or putting food on the table. I saw the anxiety in my mother's eyes. I saw the fear in my siblings not knowing whether that apartment in that tenement was something we were even going to be able to keep. That wasn't in a pandemic. That was just in normal times. Imagine in a pandemic, you are told to stay home, and there is no place to call home. We can do much better than that. We can do much better than that.

July 1, the rent is due. The mortgage payment is due. The Senate's work is due. Let's pass this bill today and make sure every American can weather the pandemic in a safe and affordable place to call home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Because a lot of my colleagues have been so thoughtful, I will have some brief remarks, and then I would ask unanimous consent that Senator CORTEZ MASTO could follow me because she is facing a tight schedule as well. I know all of my colleagues are.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I join my colleagues this afternoon in appreciation of Senator BROWN, who has been relentless—absolutely relentless—in prosecuting this cause of trying to get a fair shake for millions of Americans who are walking on an economic tightrope. Every single month, they balance the food bill against the rent bill against the energy bill, and Sen-

ator BROWN—whether it is supercharged unemployment benefits, whether it is housing, whether it is taking on the big pharmaceutical companies—is there again and again and again to stand up for people who don't have power and don't have clout, and I want to thank him especially for giving us this opportunity to focus on the avalanche of evictions that I believe will be headed in our direction in weeks if the Senate doesn't act.

Yesterday, Dr. Fauci talked about soon possibly seeing as many as 100,000 new coronavirus cases a day. You simply cannot have a healthy economy in a country suffering from mass illness and death.

There are already tens of millions of Americans out of work as a result of a pandemic that is only continuing to spread, and it has hit the whole affordability of rent for millions of Americans like a powerful storm.

According to the Census Bureau, 40 percent of Black and Latino renters are worried they will not be able to make the rent this summer due to the pandemic. That in and of itself is an outrage and an injustice.

My question for our Republican colleagues today involves this frightening day at the beginning of the month—the frightening day when families sit around a kitchen table, all across the country, and you can see the anguish in their faces when you talk to them because, around that kitchen table, they are saying to themselves: What am I going to spend our scarce dollars on this month? Is it going to be the rent? Is it going to be groceries? What about that big pile of medical bills that is off in the corner that we have to pay?

It is July 1, and the rent is due. Our question for our Republican colleagues is, What is your plan?

Senator BROWN has been leading us every day—day in, day out—with a set of sensible policies that respond to what those families are saying around their kitchen tables. We fought for the moratorium on evictions that was included in the CARES Act, but it goes poof in a few weeks.

Already this week my Republican colleagues have blocked funding for State and local governments that could have been used to help people who are walking that economic tightrope.

This morning, Leader SCHUMER and I laid out a plan that I think is a path to a dependable safety net in America and, specifically, an extension of supercharged unemployment benefits, which ties the benefit to economic conditions on the ground. It will be a financial lifeline for millions and millions of people. Republicans have been opposed to that. Those benefits are going to expire in a matter of weeks, and as I said to colleagues: Better know what you are going to be looking at when you go home in August if there hasn't been action on our legislation to make sure that there are supercharged unemployment benefits so that people can pay the rent and buy groceries.

If they are home all August long, in the heat with families, and they are going to have nowhere to turn in terms of paying for a roof over their heads and groceries, this is going to be a long, long, hot summer that will never be forgotten.

So let's be clear what is at stake. Long before the pandemic hit, housing cost too much. Homelessness was way too common, and, in my view, the rate of homelessness among children is a true national scandal.

In the wealthiest Nation on Earth, no child should be without a home. But even before the COVID crisis, 1.5 million children were experiencing homelessness—1.5 million youngsters living outside, living in cars, sleeping on floors, sleeping on the ground.

Colleagues, in my home State, they have said that school buses have had to go to the parks. They have had to go to the parks to pick up kids who are living outside with their families.

It rains once in a while in Oregon. It is cold in Oregon. And to think that kids in the richest country on Earth are spending the night in the parks and the school buses have to come and get them while we have huge tax cuts for those who are powerful and have lobbyists shows that things are really out of whack.

What I describe as it relates to those kids living in the parks—those kinds of conditions exist for youngsters all over America, and that was before the joblessness crisis hit and threw so many more working families into economic hardship.

If the Senate doesn't step up to help families stay in their homes, it is going to get much, much worse because there are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of kids facing this recipe for disaster. They are out of school. They are isolated, and they are more exposed to neglect and abuse. I am so pleased that my friend from Nevada has been talking about those families and talking about those kids.

They are hungry. Their families are facing the threat of eviction. If the Senate just sits back and allows these children to fall into homelessness, they may never have a chance to get ahead.

So what it comes down to is that the Senate has an obligation to help, and Senator BROWN is on target in saying that this is the time to pass his Emergency Rental Assistance Act. I am with him. I think we have a lot of colleagues here in the queue because they, too, want to speak up for the radical idea—what a radical proposition—that in the richest country on Earth, the vulnerable ought to have a roof over their head.

Senator BROWN's proposal is a vital step forward. I think we all agree that much more needs to be done. I am very interested in the proposal I call the DASH Act, the Decent, Affordable and Safe Housing for All Act. I hope we will be able to get serious about that in 2021.

The step to take today is to pass Senator BROWN's bill, and I look forward to

being back with our colleagues day in, day out, focusing on this crisis and making sure that nobody thinks we are going to skip away until the Republicans act.

This country faces a truly horrific eviction nightmare if action is not taken soon, and I am very pleased that my friend from Nevada is here.

I yield the floor to her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I am here today to support my colleagues and our cause to keep Americans in their homes. It is very simple. The House has already passed a number of bills to do just that, and the Senate needs to do the same thing.

In this pandemic, housing is healthcare. I know that a lot of Americans have had their lives upended by this coronavirus pandemic, but I would like you to imagine for a moment how much more chaotic your life would feel if you found out that tomorrow you are going to be evicted. Imagine trying to make sure you are washing your hands while you are living in your car.

We are in the middle of a public health crisis where we need people to be socially distancing, and that means they simply must have a safe, stable place to be at the end of the day.

We realized this months ago in my State, and that is why Governor Sisolak put a hold on evicting residents through August 31 of this year.

And Congress? Well, we passed the CARES Act to provide unemployment benefits and one-time relief. Those funds, plus the ban on evictions, were intended to help keep families in their homes.

We are 60 days away from resuming evictions in Nevada. In my State and across the country, the wave of evictions we have been holding off for a month is going to come crashing down if we do not act now.

Nevada has the highest unemployment rate in the entire country. In May, it was over 25 percent—as high as the national rate during the worst of the Great Depression. On top of that, some Nevadans haven't yet received their unemployment benefits or their pandemic unemployment benefits.

Across the country, almost half of workers earning under \$40,000 a year have lost income. Some people just don't have the ability to fully pay for the rent or mortgage, particularly when we are asking them to shelter in place.

The thing is, in Nevada, we were already in the midst of a housing crisis even before this pandemic hit us. Almost half of Nevadans are renters. That is 45 percent. Of those renters, half are cost-burdened in some way, meaning that they pay more than 30 percent of their income in rent.

Now, the Silver State has the biggest shortage in the country of affordable housing for the very lowest income Nevadans. We have just 19 units for every 100 that we need.

Eviction isn't just a matter of spending a few days scrambling to find a new place. The financial consequences can follow families for years, and as for the effects on children's physical and mental health, well, there is no way to undo that.

Believe me. I know. The foreclosure crisis hit Nevada in 2008, and I saw up close the pain that caused throughout my State when people were evicted from their homes. Lenders took the homes of more than 219,000 Nevada families during that period of time. That is why it is so vital that we pass legislation now to help Nevadans and people all across the country pay their rent and utility bills when they cannot safely go to work.

I support Senator BROWN's Emergency Rental Assistance and Rental Market Stabilization Act, as well as other bills introduced by my colleagues to keep homeowners in their homes. These bills provide essential stability to the rental and mortgage market.

We can't expect landlords to keep shouldering the burden of missed payments. Landlords have bills to pay, as well—mortgages, taxes, insurance, and staff. Without assistance from us, many of them may go bankrupt or can be forced to sell their properties.

Experts estimate that Nevada is going to need nearly \$1 billion in rental assistance to keep families housed this year. Landlords can't lift the load and neither can State budgets that are already stretched too thin.

So let's focus here on the essentials, the basic need for things like shelter. Let's keep people safe and off the streets. Let's pass Senator BROWN's rental assistance bill, Senator REED's housing assistance fund bill to help homeowners avoid foreclosure, and Senator MENENDEZ's housing counseling bill, and the others we need to prevent an epidemic of homelessness.

Across the Nation people are responding to the pandemic by staying at home because we asked them to do so. Now the Senate needs to do its part by making sure those homes are safe and stable so that Nevadans can continue to teach their children, care for loved ones who are ill, and avoid spreading coronavirus to others. In the midst of a global pandemic, housing is healthcare, and we owe this to each other. So let's act now on behalf of the American public and American families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to support efforts by my Democratic colleagues to pass much needed and delayed economic measures by unanimous consent.

It is painfully obvious that the economy is in bad shape. Families and small businesses continue to struggle and there is a real need for further Federal assistance. In order to get our economy back on track, this body must take action in crafting another comprehensive, bipartisan COVID relief

package, and it must include additional help for families and communities including eviction and foreclosure prevention assistance, as well as additional help for State and local governments.

Last night the Senate unanimously extended the PPP application window. This was a tiny but needed step in recognizing the depth of the economic crisis Americans are facing. Now the question before us is, will Republican leaders allow this body to work its will and provide needed, targeted, and effective rescue assistance, or will it continue to delay and deny assistance which will only prolong the pandemic, deepen the financial hole, and make the remedy costlier and recovery steeper?

Strong State and local governments are critical to our economy. Indeed, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, State and local governments provide about 20 million jobs and contributed 8.5 percent to the national GDP in 2019. They did so by not only serving as customers and clients for our local and national businesses, but also by providing the essential services, such as public infrastructure, a strong education system, and other necessary functions that provide the business certainty that make our country attractive to businesses and investors throughout the world. We should do everything possible to maintain our country's comparative advantage relative to other countries.

But today, as a result of the tremendous economic shock created by the coronavirus and the lack of a coherent public health strategy from the Trump administration, estimated State revenue shortfalls will total about \$615 billion over the next 3 fiscal years, not including the added costs of fighting COVID-19. This is just for the States—\$615 billion.

This is why I initially fought for \$750 billion in the Coronavirus Relief Fund when negotiating the CARES Act and introduced S. 3671, the State & Local Emergency Stabilization Fund Act, which would provide an additional \$600 billion to State and local governments to supplement the \$150 billion in coronavirus relief funds I secured in the CARES Act.

Madam President, would it surprise you to learn that the Trump Treasury Department has needlessly created a bureaucratic regulation that makes it difficult for States to use these coronavirus relief funds? And that this regulation is standing in the way of what should have been an immediate \$150 billion boost to our economy, which even the Chamber of Commerce thinks is burdensome. Because of this onerous Trump rule, States can't use the coronavirus relief funds to replace lost or delayed tax revenues in order to maintain public services.

That is what Neil Bradley, the U.S. Chamber's chief policy officer said in an interview, "Part of our conversation with Republicans on Capitol Hill is

that, ironically, if your concern is big State government, then the last thing you need to do is force States to replace one-time lost revenue with permanent tax increases."

As the primary author of the Coronavirus Relief Fund, I can tell you that it is fully within the Treasury Secretary's authority and the intent of the CARES Act for these funds to be used to replace lost or delayed tax revenues and maintain public services. To prevent the flexible use of these relief funds is a choice that is neither required nor intended by law.

Unfortunately, this completely unnecessary choice has already created avoidable economic harm.

Since February, State and local governments have cut a total of 1.5 million jobs, an 8-percent drop that is twice the decline seen during and after the 2007–2009 recession. In addition, the Center for Economic and Policy Research reports that "job losses forced on State and local governments by pandemic-related shortfalls will disproportionately impact the African American workforce . . . 14 percent of state and local employees were African American compared to 11.7 percent of private sector employees, a margin of 20 percent."

As the Wall Street Journal reported in a May 24, 2020, article titled "State and Local Budget Woes Create Drag for Economic Recovery Prospects":

Based on evidence from the last recession, Mr. Chodorow-Reich, a Harvard economics professor, estimates that every dollar in cuts costs the economy \$1.50 to \$2. He also said every additional dollar in spending adds \$1.50 to \$2 to the economy.

Of all the regulations that this administration seeks to cut, it should start with this one if it really wants a healthy economy. With just one stroke of the Treasury Secretary's pen, our economy can receive a direct multibillion dollar jolt today.

But to be clear, this administrative fix is by no means sufficient because of the massive revenue shortfalls our State and local governments are facing. Congress still needs to provide additional and flexible fiscal relief to our State and local governments as part of its next fiscal package, and it is my hope that S. 3671, the State & Local Stabilization Fund Act, is included.

As I indicated earlier in my remarks, keeping families in their homes also must be included in the next package.

According to Nicholas Chiumenti, with the New England Public Policy Center in the research department at the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston:

If current economic activity does not improve substantially, without an extension of the CARES Act, unemployment insurance or additional stimulus money or other fiscal relief, up to 13 percent of homeowners and 33 percent of renters in Rhode Island are at the risk of being unable to pay their mortgage or rent payments. This represents over 80,000 Rhode Island households.

Nationally, according to census survey data, 23 percent of all adults reported being housing insecure in mid-

June, meaning that they had missed last month's rent or mortgage payment or had slight or no confidence that their household could pay next month's rent or mortgage on time.

We know that behind each one of these numbers is a family that can be homeless at the worst possible time in the middle of a public health emergency.

For some, given their current health situations and age, there will be an additional human toll that we surely should strive to avoid. We implore our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with us to keep our constituents in their homes so that they too can make it to the other side of this public health emergency.

In that spirit, I draw your attention to S. 3620, the Housing Assistance Fund. This legislation expands the existing "Hardest Hit Fund" model and provides it with additional resources for each State to keep families in their homes, the utilities on, the internet connected, and the property taxes paid. As a result, landlords who are also struggling to pay their own bills would receive some assistance.

Madam President, it is not every day that the Independent Community Bankers of America and the Credit Union National Association support the same legislation with consumer rights and affordable housing organizations, such as the National Housing Conference, the National Low Income Housing Coalition, the Center for Responsible Lending, and the National Consumer Law Center, among others. As we work toward this next fiscal relief package, I hope you and our colleagues will consider joining with us in enacting S. 3620, the Housing Assistance Fund.

But we can't stop there. We must also immediately, among other needs, increase SNAP benefits to help the almost 150,000 Rhode Islanders who are food insecure during this crisis; boost public health efforts to help keep the virus at bay, from more testing and contact tracing to supporting our healthcare providers, to developing effective vaccine deployment systems; help childcare centers, public schools, and college campuses to safely reopen and support libraries in keeping our communities connected; provide relief for the hardest hit small and mid-sized businesses, many of which will continue to be shut down for the foreseeable future; and safeguard our election infrastructure, as Russia and other foreign actors seek again to use voter suppression, hacking, and disinformation in the 2020 elections.

What exactly are we waiting for? Is it not enough that, according to a June 29 CNBC article, "the employment-population ratio—the number of employed people as a percentage of the U.S. adult population—plunged to 52.8 percent in May, meaning 47.2 percent of Americans are jobless, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics?

Is it not enough that 46 percent of Business Roundtable CEOs expect em-

ployment at their companies to decrease in the next 6 months?

We don't need to inflict any further unnecessary economic pain and suffering. I would also urge my colleagues to consider the costs of inaction.

Indeed, during an April 29, 2020, press conference, Federal Reserve Chairman Powell stated:

I have long-time been an advocate for the need for the United States to return to a sustainable path from a fiscal perspective at the Federal level. We have not been on such a path for some time, which . . . just means that the debt is growing faster than the economy.

This is not the time to act on those concerns. This is the time to use the great fiscal power of the United States to do what we can to support the economy and try to get through this with as little damage to the longer-run productive capacity of the economy as possible.

This week we are also considering the National Defense Authorization Act, and every year for the last 59 years, Democrats and Republicans have come together to strengthen our national security and to help all Americans. We have proven that we are more than capable of working together productively on the most complex and controversial issues in service of our constituents, and we would like to continue that not just in the context of national defense but in the context of economic prosperity and security.

One final point. We also need to extend unemployment compensation insurance because we know it will run out, and everyone has told us that unemployment rates will not drop dramatically. They will stay persistently high. People will need this assistance going forward.

We must do more, and I hope we can do much more going forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have a motion to be made, but before making it, I yield 3 minutes each to Senator KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota and Senator SCHATZ from Hawaii.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank Senator INHOFE so much for his allowing me to say a few words. I know it is his time. And I thank my friend JACK REED.

Today is July 1, which means that rent and mortgage payments are due, and as I speak today, so many families across this country are being forced to make the difficult decision about how they will make this month's payment to stay in their homes.

Even before the pandemic began, almost one-fourth of all renters, or 11 million households, were forced to pay more than half of their income for housing—half of their income. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, more than half a million people experienced homelessness on a

given night before the pandemic, and that has just gotten worse.

That is why I am a strong supporter of Senator BROWN's Emergency Rental Assistance and Rental Market Stabilization Act, which will provide \$100 billion in emergency funding. I am also proud to support Senator REED's bill as well as the work of Senator MENENDEZ.

The pandemic, as we know, has wide and longstanding racial disparities in housing. We had a 30-percent gap in Black and White ownership rates before the pandemic due to discriminatory practices, and it has only made it worse.

St. Paul Mayor Melvin Carter, a leader and a good friend, has repeatedly reminded us that this means investing in programs like section 8 housing, which still remains unavailable to so many families.

Yes, we need to address this shortage of affordable housing. We need to take action now. I thank my colleagues. We have an opportunity. The Fourth of July is at the beginning of July, but by the end of July, we had better have gotten something done, and that means help our State and local governments; that means funding for elections; and that means making sure we are responding to the crisis in housing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, today is the 1st of the month, and that means the rent is due, but for the 9 million renters who have lost their jobs, they may not be able to pay.

Now, in March, we made sure that the CARES Act included cash assistance, unemployment benefits, and suspensions on evictions and mortgage forbearance to help the people who have been hurt the most by this pandemic. Lots of States and counties have set up their own programs, either subsidies or prohibitions on evictions themselves, but we are now 3 months later, and unemployment benefits stand to expire at the end of this month and moratoriums that allowed families to stay in their homes are ending. Eviction courts are reopening. Think about that. Eviction courts are reopening.

So what we are facing is a ticking timebomb. We are facing the fact that it is true that people got forbearance on their rent or forbearance on their mortgage, but I remember very well in March and April, as I explained to the people of Hawaii, you are getting forbearance not forgiveness, which means you just simply don't have to pay your mortgage or your rent this month. You do have to eventually pay your mortgage or your rent.

So what is going to happen is, for the most economically challenged among us in the United States, they are going to face a huge backpayment at the beginning of August or the beginning of September, and they are going to lose the place they live in.

Now, I am very, very hopeful that cooler heads will prevail and that we

will intervene in July and incorporate the legislation Senator BROWN is leading because the rent is going to be due, and we are going to—just as we faced this pandemic square in the eyes, we are going to be facing a massive eviction crisis. We have to take action.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, while we continue negotiating an agreement on amendments, I think we need to move forward and start voting on some of the amendments we know need votes.

Therefore, in just a minute, I will call up the Paul amendment regarding the withdrawing of troops from Afghanistan. While I disagree with the substance of the amendment, I think the Senate should vote on it. So, at 5:30 today, I will move to table the amendment. We have talked to Senator PAUL's office about this.

AMENDMENT NO. 2011

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up the Paul amendment No. 2011 to the text proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for Mr. PAUL, proposes an amendment numbered 2011.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To withdraw all United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan)

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1216. WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM AFGHANISTAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Joint Resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against those responsible for the attacks launched against the United States (Public Law 107-40) states, "That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001".

(2) Since 2001, more than 3,002,635 men and women of the United States Armed Forces have deployed in support of the Global War on Terrorism, with more than 1,400,000 of them deploying more than once, and these Americans who volunteered in a time of war have served their country honorably and with distinction.

(3) In November 2009 there were fewer than 100 Al-Qaeda members remaining in Afghanistan.

(4) On May 2, 2011, Osama Bin Laden, the founder of Al-Qaeda, was killed by United States Armed Forces in Pakistan.

(5) United States Armed Forces have successfully routed Al-Qaeda from the battlefield in Afghanistan, thus fulfilling the original intent of Public Law 107-40 and the justification for the invasion of Afghanistan, but public support for United States continued presence in Afghanistan has waned in recent years.

(6) An October 2018 poll found that 57 percent of Americans, including 69 percent of United States veterans, believe that all United States troops should be removed from Afghanistan.

(7) In June 2018, the Department of Defense reported, "The al-Qa'ida threat to the United States and its allies and partners has decreased and the few remaining al-Qa'ida core members are focused on their own survival".

(b) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, or designee, in cooperation with the heads of all other relevant Federal agencies involved in the conflict in Afghanistan shall—

(1)(A) formulate a plan for the orderly drawdown and withdrawal of all soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines from Afghanistan who were involved in operations intended to provide security to the people of Afghanistan, including policing action, or military actions against paramilitary organizations inside Afghanistan, excluding members of the military assigned to support United States embassies or consulates, or intelligence operations authorized by Congress; and

(B) appear before the relevant congressional committees to explain the proposed implementation of the plan formulated under subparagraph (A); and

(2)(A) formulate a framework for political reconciliation and popular democratic elections independent of United States involvement in Afghanistan, which may be used by the Government of Afghanistan to ensure that any political party that meets the requirements under Article 35 of the Constitution of Afghanistan is permitted to participate in general elections; and

(B) appear before the relevant congressional committees to explain the proposed implementation of the framework formulated under subparagraph (A).

(c) REMOVAL AND BONUSES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) all United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan as of such date of enactment shall be withdrawn and removed from Afghanistan; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense shall provide all members of the United States Armed Forces who were deployed in support of the Global War on Terror with a \$2,500 bonus to recognize that these Americans have served in the Global War on Terrorism exclusively on a volunteer basis and to demonstrate the heartfelt gratitude of our Nation.

(d) REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.—The Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40) is repealed effective on the earlier of—

(1) the date that is 395 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date on which the Secretary of Defense certifies that all United States Armed Forces involved in operations or military actions in Afghanistan (as described in subsection (b)(1)(A)) have departed from Afghanistan.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as I said earlier, I will move to table the Paul amendment at 5:30 today, and Senators should expect a rollcall vote at that time.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Congress has taken action in response to the coronavirus pandemic and its significant effects on workers, families, and the economy. It is because the State, Federal, and local governments shut down the U.S. economy for the first time in the 240-year history of our country.

We enacted four laws in March and April, which CBO says has increased the deficit by at least \$2.4 trillion, but that doesn't measure the entirety of the relief. If you add in support from programs initiated by the Fed and the Treasury, you would add trillions more of relief.

One of the recent pieces of legislation, the CARES Act, devoted \$150 billion of direct Federal relief to governments of the States, localities, territories, the District of Columbia, and Tribes. That is around 16 percent of the total fiscal year 2020 State general fund expenditures enacted prior to the public emergency.

In addition to the \$150 billion, CBO has identified hundreds of billions more from the various relief programs that are directed to State and local governments. From the \$340 billion of emergency funding in the CARES Act alone, the Senate appropriators have told me that more than 80 percent, or roughly \$275 billion, goes to States and localities.

So, you can see, the CARES Act alone provided \$150 billion of direct aid to State and local governments, and the emergency funding added \$275 billion. That means that \$425 billion in the CARES Act is directed to governments of the States, localities, territories, Tribes, and the District of Columbia. That happens to be 47 percent of the total State general revenue expenditures enacted prior to the public emergency for fiscal year 2020 and about the same percentage of enacted total State revenue.

On top of that, the Fed has allowed use of municipal securities as collateral for bank lending to help ease borrowing costs for local and State governments. Treasury and the Fed also established a Municipal Liquidity Facility. The purpose of it is to "help state and local governments better manage cash flow pressures."

The Fed will buy up to \$500 billion of debt from State, counties, and cities. As others have noted here on this very floor, a significant amount of the funding directed to States and localities and the like are still in the pipeline and remain unspent or even unallocated. Some States, as I understand it, have not even allocated any money downstream to their own local governments from the \$150 billion of direct aid provided under the CARES Act.

Despite all that, we have heard a number of calls for massive amounts of additional spending. The reason, ac-

cording to most people asking for more, is that the direct aid for States and localities in the CARES Act is too restrictive and cannot be used to replace lost revenue. I am sympathetic to the idea of giving States and localities more flexibility in how to use \$150 billion of direct relief provided in the CARES Act if it is not needed for the virus health issues. Beyond that, I want you to know I am more skeptical, until we get more solid numbers on unrealized State and local revenue and the impact of the CARES dollars not yet allowed.

I recently heard the minority leader here on the floor attempting to scold us Republicans for not doing exactly what he wants, exactly when he wants it, and saying we need to immediately spend more, including more direct aid to States. Of course, in his partisan political analysis, Republicans are blamed for not wanting massive amounts of additional aid for State and local governments because what he believes is ideological opposition to government in general.

Now, that is quite a stretch, even for the minority leader. Republicans supported four pieces of legislation in recent months providing hundreds of billions of dollars in relief to State and local governments in various ways.

I heard the Governor of California instruct Congress on moral and ethical grounds, saying that it is our duty to give more funding to States and localities or else first responders will be the first ones laid off by cities and counties. It is almost like the first argument when we were just about ready to shut down the Federal Government, if we don't finance everything, first thing we are going to do is shut down the Washington Monument.

While that may have been a subtle threat from the Governor of California to use as leverage to pressure Congress to provide more funds to California, it is unfortunate that State and local governments laid off so many of their workers in recent months. That doesn't seem to be much dedication by government to its workforce.

I heard from associations of Governors, associations of counties, cities, and other municipal governments that they need between a half a trillion and a trillion more in direct aid from the Federal Government. Usually, they cite a need to "replace lost revenue."

Many have asked for funds to cover lost revenue as far out as two additional fiscal years beyond fiscal year 2020. Most of those requests are based on forecasts of what the pandemic and the economy will look like for the rest of the year and even in coming years.

I think you have to take those forecasts with a grain of salt. Just look at what the last employment report looked like relative to the forecasts, and you can tell how cloudy people's crystal balls are right now.

I heard from some here on the floor that Moody's thinks States and localities may need hundreds of billions

more in direct relief. People haven't been very careful, though, in reading the Moody's reports that are the basis of their arguments.

Moody's Analytics, which makes very clear in the report that it is not an arm of Moody's that rates bonds—though, I am not sure everyone is clear on that—Moody's Analytics said in April that under their most severely adverse assumptions about the future, State and local governments would have a budget shortfall of around \$172 billion over the next 15 months and more than \$450 billion if you extend out to cover the years 2022.

Again, this is all based on shaky forecasts, and it is not at all clear that the ratings on municipal bonds done by the Moody's ratings agency align with the forecasts of Moody's Analytics.

More recently, Moody's Analytics' chief economist, Mark Zandi, who is a regular proponent of Keynesian stimulus for the Democratic Party, upped the estimate of the needs to about \$500 billion. That number remarkably matches what we heard from the National Governors Association about 6 weeks ago. Dr. Zandi promises so-called bang-for-the-buck magic to save States and localities, but the government will have to pony up perhaps a half a trillion more just to start that magic. So I am skeptical, to put it mildly.

If you remember, it was that kind of reasoning that led to the Obama stimulus promising vague and relatively quick unemployment deductions following the financial crisis but failed to come even close to these promised results.

Finally, regarding funding requests, there is the Heroes Act over at the House. State and local aid in that act provides nearly \$1 trillion to States and localities inside a liberal wish list in their bill.

That, along with what we have already done, would put State and local relief at more than 75 percent of all combined State and local tax collections for a year, depending how you measure things. That is more of a Federal bailout than the partnership that we are asked to finance.

I have heard a lot of calls for massive amounts of additional direct aid to our States, funded by Federal debt. Yet there still is a lot of money in the pipeline that hasn't even been used yet. And future needs of States and localities are highly uncertain—too uncertain, in my view—to commit the Federal Government today to half a trillion dollars or \$1 trillion more to States and localities, on top of the \$425 billion or more of funding already in play and up to \$500 billion of credit support.

I am highly skeptical of schemes to index future aid to measures of the incidence of COVID-19 cases, since we already have had controversies surrounding those measures, and some of them are political controversies.

Of course, I do understand budget rules that States and localities operate

under. They do provide constraints. I also believe that proponents of massive amounts of additional Federal aid to States and localities overstate the severity of those constraints. I think State budgets are more flexible and fungible, for example, than some would have us believe.

We have seen that flexibility recently in legislators' consideration of altering police funding or using taxpayers' funds to erect barriers in occupied zones of lawlessness as just one example of that flexibility.

There are also many issues about incentives associated with massive new amounts of direct Federal funding of State and local governments. Sending massive amounts of additional Federal funds to States that were responsible in good times and built up rainy day funds means that they are treated the same as States that didn't build much, if any, in rainy day funds, as I said, Illinois and New Jersey, for examples. Those States that acted irresponsibly then get rewarded.

Since funds in State and local governments are fungible, sending massive amounts of additional Federal dollars to States and localities means that hard-earned Federal tax dollars coming from Iowa, as an example, can end up helping financially unsustainable pension promises of fiscally irresponsible States, and it means that Federal tax revenues get channeled to States run by politicians who will not even enforce existing Federal laws and who use taxpayer resources on lawless occupied zones or sanctuary cities to provide benefits to undocumented residents. There are many of my constituents in Iowa who do not support those uses of Federal funds.

So, as I wind down here, I am highly skeptical of sending massive amounts of additional funds to States and localities, since future needs are so highly uncertain and there is still unspent money in the pipelines.

I am, however, sympathetic to providing additional flexibility for funds we have already provided in the CARES Act so that State and local communities can make broader uses of those funds. And I believe that if the pandemic and the economy worsens, under those circumstances, future needs can be addressed when needed.

I understand that there are a range of views regarding additional funds for States and localities. At this point, I believe it may be useful to entertain more flexibility in what has already been approved, and there may be a need to make sure that States get shares of money they have received to counties and cities. There may even be a reasoned case for limited additional funding to States and localities in the near term, although, as I said, I am a bit skeptical.

But approving half a trillion dollars to \$1 trillion of additional funds for uncertain future needs right now to cover unknown State and local needs as far out as 2 years down the road just isn't

the responsible or prudent action to take.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, Senator UDALL and I are pleased to present a bipartisan amendment that will finally end America's longest war. Our amendment will finally and completely end the war in Afghanistan.

Over 4,000 Americans have died in Afghanistan, and over 20,000 have been wounded. It is time to bring our soldiers home.

I supported going into Afghanistan originally. Had I been in Congress at that time, I would have voted in favor of it. But the people who attacked us on 9/11 have all been killed or captured. Most of the people fighting us today are their successors or children or the children of their children. In fact, we now have soldiers who were born after 9/11 serving in Afghanistan.

The cycle shows no sign of ending. The war shows no sign of ending. It is not sustainable to keep fighting in Afghanistan generation after generation. We have been fighting in Afghanistan for so long that our youngest soldiers fighting there weren't even born at the time.

We have spent about \$1 trillion to establish an Afghan Government—a government that is rife with corruption and dysfunction. We spent more to rebuild Afghanistan than the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe after World War II. We have built infrastructure in Afghanistan and then watched it deteriorate and watched the Afghans be unable to even maintain the infrastructure we built for them, and then they ask us for more money to maintain the structure. Meanwhile, our roads and our bridges crumble here at home as we rebuild the infrastructure in Afghanistan.

One example is, several years ago, we reportedly hired a local security consultant to help secure the roads at a cost of \$1 million per year. But according to the report by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, American officials came to suspect that the money was being funneled to insurgents to stage attacks on our infrastructure to justify the security contract. So our money was going to a guy who was paying insurgents to pretend to attack him so he could provide security for their infrastructure. It is crazy.

We spent \$43 million on a natural gas gas station. Guess how many vehicles in Afghanistan run on natural gas. Zero. You can't even find the gas station. My staff went there to see if the money had been spent, and they couldn't go there because it was too unsafe. Now the report is that the gas

station has been abandoned—\$43 million.

We spent nearly \$80 million on a luxury hotel. Why is the American taxpayer building luxury hotels in Kabul? Guess what. A contractor ran off with the money. It is a skeleton. The Taliban are now said to climb up into the structure and shoot down at our Embassy. What kind of foolhardy nature of government are we that we continue to stay there?

These are just a few of the many examples that have had us spend more than we spent in Europe on the Marshall Plan.

We continue to pour good money after bad into Afghanistan, hoping that the outcome will somehow change, hoping that maybe the first 20 years will produce better results than the last 20 years did.

This NDAA, this defense authorization that we are debating here in the Senate, even has the sense of the Senate in it opposing a precipitous withdrawal from Afghanistan. We have been there for 20 years. How can we characterize withdrawal after 20 years, after we defeated the enemy, as precipitous? It is crazy. The American people say "Come home," and this is your chance.

Many people have said that we should end the war. Today, you get to vote. Are you for staying in Afghanistan for another generation? Are you for continuing a war that has lost its purpose? Today, we get to vote up or down: Are you for the war or against the war? Does the war still have a mission?

The American people know better. They are ready to declare victory and come home. It is why President Trump's message resonated with so many. He said "It is time to come home," and the people agreed.

Not only is it time to end the war and focus on our needs at home, but it is time to reward those who fought the battle. We are spending \$50 billion a year over there.

From the savings in the first year, in our amendment, Senator UDALL and I will provide a \$2,500 bonus for anyone who has been deployed in the long War on Terror. That is a pretty good bonus. Our soldiers deserve it, and they also deserve to come home because there is no military mission left.

Instead of spending another \$50 billion in Afghanistan next year, let's give some of that money to our soldiers who fought the war, and let's begin saving some money from the massive deficit we face here at home.

This is the Senate's chance to show that it is time to declare victory. It is time to come home.

I urge support for my amendment, and I also remind Senators this is your chance to vote to end a war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I thank you for the recognition, and I thank Senator INHOFE. I talked to him.

I would ask unanimous consent, as Senator PAUL did, to complete my remarks and unanimous consent to complete my remarks right here on the floor before we have the vote.

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I am a strong supporter of the AFGHAN Service Act, which I introduced with Senator PAUL.

It has been nearly 19 years since the United States entered this war in Afghanistan after the 9/11 attacks, and we have had several Presidents—one a Democrat, one a Republican—say they want to end this war. They announced: We don't want endless wars. We want to end this war.

Our current President has said he wanted to do this for the last 3½ years. He hasn't gotten it done. President Obama wanted to end it.

This is the way—the responsible way—to end this war. We give a year timeframe. We make absolutely clear we are not against our American soldiers. We give them a bonus, and we say: You have done a good job.

So don't listen to the distortions that will be talked about what this amendment is about.

We have soldiers who are heading to fight in this war who weren't even born when it began, and most of the soldiers I have talked to who have come home from Afghanistan believe we should be out of there. That is one of the most persuasive things I have seen. Several of those soldiers have been elected to the U.S. Congress and have spoken up very, very strongly about continuing our war in Afghanistan.

It has been nearly 10 years since I first came to the Senate floor in 2010 to call for the withdrawal of U.S. combat forces from Afghanistan. We have accomplished our goal of routing al-Qaida and killing Osama Bin Laden. Those were two of the big things that were talked about originally when President Bush went in and basically said: We have these short-term objectives, we are going to get them achieved, and then we are going to be out.

We have achieved those objectives. There is no reason for delay and to continue this endless war. The longer we stay with an ill-defined mission, the greater the risk of a wider war in the region. Believe me, I listen to people back home. They don't want a wider war. They want us to bring our troops home.

The recent news that has gripped the Capitol only underscores that our men and women in Afghanistan remain in harm's way. They should be brought home and focus on our core national security.

After 19 years of war, peace in Afghanistan will need to come from negotiation, and the United States can and should continue to play a role in those diplomatic efforts.

This legislation ends the U.S. involvement in the war in a responsible

way, with a yearlong timeframe. It also sunsets the 9/11 AUMF, which has been stretched beyond recognition to justify wars we never considered.

Even to this day, some in this administration envision using the 2001 AUMF to justify a war with Iran rather than actually standing on the floor and introducing a proposal, as required by the Constitution to get in a war, as is Congress's authority.

On the AUMF, this isn't something sudden either; it would give Congress a year to consider a new AUMF, if needed.

It is long past time for Congress to make the difficult decision and stop ducking the votes on whether to send our troops into harm's way.

Finally, this amendment rewards the veterans of these wars. We owe a lot more to them, but this is a start.

I hope you will join me in supporting the end of the U.S. war in Afghanistan and support the restoration of congressional war-making authority and vote against tabling this amendment. This amendment deserves an up-or-down vote, not a tabling vote, so vote no to tabling this amendment. I say this in great respect to Senator INHOFE, and I know that Senator INHOFE has been very courteous in terms of the time.

At this point, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, there is another side to this story, and I think, when you hear those promoting this particular amendment, it is one we all agree—we want an end to the war. We want this to happen. But there are some other reasons that this probably is not the best way to do it.

First of all, the amendment directs a calendar-based withdrawal from Afghanistan rather than a conditions-based. We have talked about this quite often. It is something that you can't just say "It is going to happen by this date" but, rather, under these certain circumstances.

It undermines peace negotiations and the Trump administration's Afghan strategy. He has talked about that publicly. I think a lot of people agree with that. I do.

It would also undermine the February 2020 U.S. agreement with the Taliban that tries to map out a path to peace. According to the plan, U.S. forces' reductions must be tied to Taliban counterterrorism commitments. That is part of the plan.

Repealing it—the 2001 authorization for use of military force—would undermine the authority of the President of the United States for countering terrorists in Afghanistan but also would undermine the GTMO detention and other global counterterrorist efforts.

The DOD and the White House would oppose this because it removes an authority for using military force and would significantly undermine counterterrorism authority.

So I move to table the Paul amendment No. 2011, and I ask 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 motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alexander	Grassley	Risch
Barrasso	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Rosen
Boozman	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Rubio
Carper	Jones	Sasse
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Collins	King	Scott (SC)
Coons	Lankford	Shaheen
Cornyn	Loeffler	Shelby
Cotton	Manchin	Sinema
Cramer	McConnell	Sullivan
Crapo	McSally	Thune
Cruz	Menendez	Tillis
Ernst	Moran	Toomey
Feinstein	Murphy	Warner
Fischer	Perdue	Whitehouse
Gardner	Portman	Wicker
Graham	Reed	Young

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Durbin	Peters
Bennet	Gillibrand	Sanders
Booker	Harris	Schatz
Braun	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Smith
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Leahy	Udall
Cortez Masto	Lee	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Paul	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Blunt	Hyde-Smith	Murray
Burr	Markey	
Enzi	Murkowski	

The motion to table was agreed to; the amendment was tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

COVID-19 INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2020

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak to S. 3669, the COVID-19 International Response and Recovery Act of 2020.

As of this weekend, there are an estimated 10 million confirmed cases of COVID-19 worldwide. More than 2.5 million of those cases are right here in the United States. The disease has claimed over 125,000 American lives.

For anyone who questioned why we should care about what happens elsewhere in the world, this pandemic has certainly been most assuredly a wake-

up call. The virus didn't start here, but it came here and Americans are now suffering from the effects of an epidemic that shows no signs of stopping.

Even if we bring it under control in the United States, in the absence of U.S. leadership for a truly global response, the virus can and will return. We cannot safeguard American lives without one, but we cannot lead or even meaningfully participate in a global response when we don't have a coherent and effective domestic strategy.

The President's desperate denial, his refusal to take this pandemic seriously, and his seeming inability to care about the health and well-being of all Americans are as shocking as they are dangerous.

As opposed to a pandemic response strategy, the White House seems to have a dangerous public relations strategy focused on perpetuating a false narrative that insists the pandemic is almost over, blames China and the World Health Organization for its own preparedness and response failures, overstates the administration's domestic and international response, and refuses to be candid with Congress and the American people about the consequences of its irresponsible actions.

Make no mistake, contrary to what the White House would have us believe, the COVID-19 threat is far from over. As Dr. Anthony Fauci testified, it is a lack of serious response—not as some in the White House would have us believe, more tests—that is leading to the skyrocketing case numbers and hospitalization rates we are seeing today.

Unfortunately, the haphazardness that has characterized the White House's response at home has also shaped its response abroad.

Secretary Pompeo is right. The American people are the most generous on the planet, but that belies this administration's actual response. The reality is that when it comes to discussions about what it is doing to end the pandemic globally, the administration is trumpeting programs it has spent 3 years consistently and aggressively cutting, which explains perfectly why Secretary Pompeo, to this day, refuses to come before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to defend his proposed fiscal year 2021 budget.

America, the world needs a strategy to end this pandemic, not a PR blitz to cover inaction. The blame game will not help us either. Yet, instead of taking care of the business at hand, the administration is channeling its energy toward fault finding and divisive, racially inflammatory rhetoric.

First, the White House tried to say that the U.S. epidemic was the World Health Organization's fault, despite the fact that the United States was regularly communicating with and receiving information from the WHO, including through U.S. Government employees embedded at the WHO headquarters in Geneva.

In May, the administration announced a 30-day plan to review the organization's handling of the pandemic response. But less than 2 weeks after it announced that sham review, the President said he was going to withdraw from the organization—so much for the 30-day review.

Next, the administration doubled down on blaming China. The President, the Secretary of State, and the Deputy Administrator of USAID have all used racially stigmatizing language to describe COVID-19, in direct contradiction to guidance issued by our own Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. And the insistence that the rest of the world agree to use such language has prevented us from reaching consensus on statements at the G-7 and in the U.N. Security Council and seriously weakened our standing.

If this administration is truly concerned about China's malign intent at the WHO and elsewhere, there is a simple answer: Take action. If the United States leads, others will follow. If we leave the field open, others, like China, will step into the vacuum.

Isolationist, go-it-alone tactics are not the way to end a pandemic. At a time when the United States should be leading the global response to one of the greatest threats we face in the 21st century—and this pandemic will, most certainly, not be our last—I have to wonder if, instead, what we are witnessing is the death of American leadership and the end of American exceptionalism, brought about by the inattention and ineptitude of the Trump administration, both here and abroad.

Meanwhile, the rest of the world is stepping up and stepping past us. For example, when Chinese President Xi Jinping addressed the World Health Assembly in May, he pledged \$2 billion over 2 years to combat COVID-19. Secretary Azar used the opportunity to attack the WHO and cast blame on China for the pandemic.

The European Union held a pledging conference on vaccines in May, at which \$8.2 billion was raised. The United States was invited to participate, but the White House declined the invitation. Is this what the President means by "America first"?

Well, if this EU consortium comes up with a vaccine before we do, it will mean America last, as we wait for them to share it with us.

This approach is not only isolationist, shortsighted, and foolish; it is dangerous.

It is clear that the administration's response is not keeping the American people safe, and it is just as clear that there are actions we can take to effectively respond to this pandemic and better prepare for future pandemics.

Since the administration doesn't seem to have any ideas, Democrats on the Foreign Relations Committee introduced a bill to provide some. S. 3669, the COVID-19 International Response and Recovery Act, or CIRRA, presents

a clear strategy to confront the ongoing pandemic—the ongoing pandemic—and prepare the United States to deal with the next.

It compels the Trump administration to constructively engage with other countries, international organizations, and multilateral fora to stop the spread of the coronavirus.

Specifically, our bill authorizes an additional \$9 billion in funding to fight the COVID-19 pandemic through contributions toward vaccine research at the Coalition for Preparedness and Innovations; a contribution to the Global Fund for Aids, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, for its COVID-19 response mechanism; additional funding for emergency overseas humanitarian assistance in response to the pandemic, ensuring that these funds are provided both to the U.N. for its global response plan, as well as directly to NGOs working on the frontlines; and a new surge financing authority at the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation, or DFC, that will allow the DFC to expedite decisions and make strategic investments quickly to aid in COVID-19 reconstruction efforts.

CIRRA also puts in place mechanisms to help us prepare for the next pandemic. It requires an annual national intelligence estimate on pandemic threats, and it establishes a White House adviser for global health security to coordinate a whole-of-government U.S. response to global health security emergencies, aimed at improving both domestic and international capacity to prevent, respond, and detect epidemic and pandemic threats.

It clearly delineates the roles for the State Department, USAID, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in responding to pandemic threats, and it directs the U.S. Executive Director at the World Bank to begin negotiations to establish a trust fund at the World Bank designed not to compete with or supplant the World Health Organization but to work in tandem with the WHO on incentivizing countries to mobilize their own resources for epidemic and pandemic preparedness.

Now, my Republican colleague on the Foreign Relations Committee finally did introduce a modest bill in response to the pandemic. In keeping with the Republican effort to pretend that the pandemic is over, it completely ignores the current crisis.

Instead, it focuses on giving legislative cover to elite proposals from the White House that seem to strip essential pandemic response functions from USAID and put them in the State Department, and sets up a structure at the World Bank that would allow the White House to channel funding meant for the WHO into another multilateral mechanism.

Colleagues, to say that that approach is inadequate to meet the crisis of the century would be so much of an understatement as to almost be a lie in and of itself. The chairman's legislation

completely ignores the current pandemic while setting us up for failure when we are confronted by the next pandemic. We quite simply must do better.

More than 700 Americans a day are dying. Neither the finger-pointing, blame-game, race-baiting statements linked to the origins of the disease, nor a strategy centered on denial will win the battle against COVID-19.

It is painfully apparent that Congress will have to lead in this effort, just as it led in domestic relief and recovery efforts. If we fail to develop a proposal that boldly and robustly addresses the current crisis, ensures that we are adequately prepared for the next one, and aids countries around the globe with recovery, we will have failed the American people and fallen painfully short of the legacy created through initiatives such as the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief and the Marshall plan, to name a few.

We must understand that there is a recent report that came out of a potential swine flu. Well, whether it is that or something else, we have the risk of the next pandemic. Our engagement globally is not just about being a good global citizen. It is about security and health here at home.

When we can engage abroad to stop the flow of a virus, then, we ultimately achieve the success on behalf of the American people, and we leave the world with a better response. That is what we are seeking to do, and we will come back to the floor at the appropriate time to seek to move that legislation.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5084

Madam President, turning to a different topic for the moment, one that my colleague from Louisiana is also here to join me in—and I appreciate his being here—I come to the floor today, in addition to speaking about the COVID-19 international legislation, to seek unanimous consent on H.R. 5084, the Improving Corporate Governance Through Diversity Act of 2019.

This is a bipartisan piece of legislation aimed at increasing transparency in America's corporate boardrooms and ultimately lead to greater diversity in the upper tiers of America's companies.

We know that corporate America has a diversity problem. Boards and executive offices across the United States do not look like the customers they serve.

Multiple studies, including my own, have demonstrated this hard fact. Since 2010, I have conducted four surveys focused on the Fortune 100 companies looking into this problem. They had very big response rates, for which I am grateful to the companies who participated.

My latest survey revealed that since 2010, women and people of color have made only marginal gains in representations on corporate boards. For example, in 2018, women held only 25 percent of corporate board seats on Fortune 100 companies. Despite making up over half of the entire U.S. population, they

held only 25 percent of corporate board seats, and only 5.8 percent of that 25 percent were women of color. While men make up 75 percent of Fortune 100 corporate board seats, only 13.7 percent of those are men of color.

If we wanted to take a broader look, the picture is even bleaker. Latinos and Latinas make up 25 percent of the U.S. population, yet they held only 2.7 percent of corporate board seats in Fortune 100 companies. I could go on, but I think I have made the point.

I was originally hopeful that the Securities and Exchange Commission would help address this problem through its 2009 diversity disclosure rule, but the 2009 rule failed to even define diversity and gives companies far too much discretion on what they report. That is why I introduced a bill last year with Representative MEEKS to improve the SEC rule.

The bill does three main things. No. 1, it requires public companies to disclose specific information related to the racial, gender, ethnic makeup and veteran status of corporate boards and senior management—simple disclosure. No. 2, it requires public companies to disclose whether they have policies in place to promote diversity in their leadership. No. 3, it requires the SEC to establish a diversity advisory group composed of government, academic, and private sector representatives to study strategies for increasing gender, racial, and ethnic diversity in corporate America.

Let me be clear. The bill does not force companies to be more diverse, but it does require them to be more transparent about their numbers and their practices. That is valuable information that the public and potential investors should have when deciding where to put their money.

The House passed this bill on a bipartisan vote in November, and it enjoys bipartisan support here in the Senate. It is supported by a fantastic coalition that includes the NAACP, the National Urban League, the Latino Corporate Directors Association, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Corporate diversity is not just morally right; corporate diversity makes financial sense. McKinsey & Company studies have consistently found that greater diversity on executive teams has led to greater profitability. The need for increased corporate diversity is not an act of benevolence; it is a necessity for businesses looking to compete in a diverse 21st century economy.

Before I proceed to my unanimous consent request, I would like to yield to Senator KENNEDY for some remarks he has on this issue, and then I will proceed to that consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, thank you to my colleague from New Jersey for yielding me some time.

I sit on the Banking Committee with Senator MENENDEZ, and it is my privilege. I have learned a lot from listening

to him, along with our chairman, Senator CRAPO.

While convictions are important to us on the Banking Committee, so is data. I believe that as much as we can be, America is and should be a color-blind meritocracy. I believe in that.

I also believe in data. I believe in facts. This is a data bill. This is a fact bill. This doesn't make anybody do anything except be transparent.

This bill applies to public companies. Some may call them Wall Street companies, but they are spread throughout America. I make that point simply to reaffirm that this does not apply to small, publicly held companies we sometimes call Main Street businesses.

This bill is endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. This fact and data bill passed overwhelmingly in the House with a bipartisan coalition, and as Senator MENENDEZ eloquently pointed out, it simply requires public—usually large, but not always—publicly held corporations to report data with respect to their Board of Directors, nominees to the Board of Directors, and their executive officers.

The data that these companies are being asked to report is data with respect to gender, data with respect to veteran status, data with respect to ethnicity, and data with respect to race to the extent that the board members, nominees, and the executive officers themselves report that data.

Frankly, and I will end on this note, I was very surprised that we didn't have this data. In fact, when I first read Congressman MEEKS' bill and Senator MENENDEZ's bill, I thought: This can't be necessary; we must have this data at the Securities and Exchange Commission. We do not, but we will if this bill becomes law. For that reason, I rise in support of Congressman MEEKS' legislation and Senator MENENDEZ's legislation, and I support it.

With that, I would yield to Senator MENENDEZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his words and for his support, and I wish we had this already. It is not very difficult—transparency, information for which consumers can make decisions and investors can make decisions, and you would think in the 21st Century, that is not a problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to H.R. 5084; I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the purpose of the Securities and Exchange Commission

is to protect investors and to maintain orderly and efficient markets. This bill would change that deal. It would change the entire premise of the SEC. It would use the SEC to pressure people to disclose personal information that has no connection to the financial health of the company, information that many people understandably, justifiably, and with really good reason prefer to keep private. Why? Because it is not the public's business; it is theirs.

The bill requires businesses to probe the race, gender, ethnicity, and veteran status of not only those already on the senior payroll of their companies but also anyone who is even considered for those positions.

Secondly, the free market already provides a way to achieve these goals. If investors prefer to invest in companies that have certain kinds of people on their boards and certain kinds of people in executive positions, then companies have a financial incentive to disclose that information. No one is stopping them from doing that. Many companies do, in fact, disclose that information. Many companies are already providing this information because their customers and their investors are demanding it.

Government is neither omniscient nor omnipotent. It is not a deity. It is just force. It is just organized, collective official force. That is all it is. We should not use the heavy hand of government for things that the American people already have the opportunity to do on their own and in many, if not most, cases already are doing on their own.

Finally, the bill co-opts Federal employees at the SEC to create a diversity advisory group of government bureaucrats and academics who would advise Congress on policies to increase ethnic and gender diversity on corporate boards.

We already have a diversity advisory group. We already have it. It is the millions of Americans whom we represent. To think that bureaucrats at the SEC could inform Congress of the importance of inclusion and diversity better than the American people is wasteful, and to think that it is appropriate to vest in the SEC an entity designed to protect investors from fraudulent activities of those running these enterprises is just the wrong conception, not only of the SEC but of government in general.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I am not surprised, but I am deeply disappointed that my colleague takes that position. First of all, the SEC has had a diversity rule since 2009. It has a diversity rule, but the diversity rule as they devised it doesn't do anything about transparency of information. So we are not creating something at the SEC that the SEC itself wasn't pursuing in the protection of investors.

If I were an investor, I would like to know whether a company is diverse or not. Latinos represent 25 percent of the population, the fastest growing, largest minority in the Nation. I would like to know if the money I am going to put into a stock—buying a stock of a company—does it reflect the understanding of that community in any way? African Americans—does it reflect that understanding? Does it reflect the understanding that 50 percent of the population are women?

The free market—yes, the free market works on information. You make decisions in the free market based on information, but when the information is hidden from you, when you can't find out, in fact, what is the diversity of the corporate board, senior executive management, procurement and other things, then the free market doesn't work very well, does it?

The heavy hand of government—oh, my God—to disclose, to be transparent—that is the heavy hand of government? When the government doesn't work to make our systems more transparent so that investors and consumers can make decisions, who will do that? The free market? I don't think so.

The Senator from Utah, I know, has been very much an advocate of transparency in other matters; somehow, in this one, it seems to be a problem. And to protect investors—yes, we ought to protect investors because investors who would be making investments in a company that is devoid of African Americans, devoid of Latinos, devoid of the representation of who America is today may think twice about the large pension funds and other entities. They may say: Wait a minute. Maybe that is not the type of company I want to invest in.

But the investor will not know that unless they have that information. I would think, in the 21st century, when we see the national debate that is taking place today on the questions of race, on questions of ethnicity and other things, we would want to at least have the data so that we can make intelligent decisions.

By the way, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—the Chamber of Commerce is normally not on my side. They came and testified specifically in support of this provision. They represent business in America, and they came forth and said: We believe that, in fact, this is good for business. If it weren't good for business, they wouldn't be there. They wouldn't be advocating for it.

So we will succeed at this. We may not have done it today by this process, but we will succeed at this because the Nation requires it. It is good accountability. It is good transparency. It is good for the free market to know what the information is so people can make decisions. It is certainly, at the end of the day, about protecting investors. So I look forward to making that happen at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have deep affection and adoration for my friend

and colleague, the Senator from New Jersey. I do respectfully but strongly disagree with his position on this.

He made the point several times that if he were acting as an investor, he would very much like to know the composition of a corporate board or an executive team within a corporation, which is great. A lot of people feel the same way. That isn't the question. No one is stopping a corporation from disclosing that information. In fact, a whole lot of corporations do.

Some may not want to do that. Some might want to disclose some of this information but not all of it. Some might not want to be in a position of asking probing questions regarding the gender and ethnicity and race of their employees, understanding that it will then be disclosed to the public under the crushing force of Federal law.

There are legitimate reasons why a company might not want to do that, some of which have to do with that company's own ability to treat its employees and its board members and its executive team with dignity and respect. In some circumstances, not everything is the government's business.

Transparency, yes. It is absolutely something that I believe in. Transparency usually refers to what we need when it comes to government action. Transparency is what we demand when we require open public hearings when government does business. Transparency is what we require when we allow government documents to be made public and allow the public to see what the regulatory process is doing.

Transparency doesn't mean that everything that everyone does in America that has a tie to economic activity is the public's business. The fact that it is publicly traded doesn't mean it is owned by the government.

So the statement made by my colleague to the effect that when information is hidden from you, then the free market doesn't work very well—I don't understand what that means. If what he is suggesting is that it is hidden in violation of law, that is not the case. If what he is suggesting is that the free market can't punish those who refuse to disclose information about the boards and reward those who do, that is exactly what the free market does. The free market has every opportunity to work here. It is not as though nobody is providing this information, but it is not their business.

As to the suggestion that because the Chamber of Commerce supports this, therefore it is pro-business, and because it is pro-business, we should all support it, I respectfully but strongly disagree. I know that as a Republican, I am supposed to automatically agree with what the Chamber of Commerce says. Sometimes I do, but, you know, a whole lot of the time, I don't.

This goes back a long time. It goes back to the time when the U.S. Chamber of Commerce opposed a massive tax reform bill that was proposed by President Calvin Coolidge. I found some relief in the fantastic, eponymous book

“Coolidge” about President Coolidge and his proposal of that reform—a reform that, by the way, helped build America’s middle class and resulted in explosive economic growth. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce opposed that reform.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce gets a lot of things wrong, and it is wrong here. This isn’t the government’s business. These businesses are not government. They can do what they want, and it is not our place to say otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate the intellectual exercise we are going through on the floor. I will just make two final comments because I know that my colleague is anxiously waiting to talk about the need for people to be able to put food on the table.

Look, the Securities and Exchange Commission exists, yes, to protect investors and also the marketplace, but they make all types of demands upon the companies that are publicly traded in terms of disclosure of information, so I don’t know what is so difficult about that.

I will say this: The Nation will have a rude awakening if it thinks it can continue with business as usual—a rude awakening.

Something as simple as simply knowing the information about diversity on corporate boards, which every study shows actually improves the bottom line and which investors should be able to have to make those decisions—and we are not talking about the employees; we are talking about the corporate board members, my God, the people who make billions of dollars of decisions, who ultimately decide whether they go to a community or don’t go to a community to invest in, who ultimately get the dollars from the communities that I like to see represented. It is good enough to take our money, but it is not good enough to have us have any representation. And evidently this body is not even good enough to have the information so I know who is taking my money without representation. That cannot be. That cannot be the American way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, as my distinguished friend and colleague from New Jersey says, the fact that they make all types of demands on publicly traded companies is not a substitute for an actual logical or legal argument as to why they are entitled to information that is not theirs—information these companies may or may not choose to collect because that is their business. It is not the government’s business, and it sure as heck isn’t the government.

So the fact that they make all types of demands on publicly traded companies doesn’t prove the point here. We have to remember something, and, yes, we have to remember it right now in

this moment—not in spite of this moment but because of it. Government is for. We have seen the catastrophic consequences of people who lose sight of what government is for and what its limitations are.

The fact is that we don’t have access to angels, as James Madison described it in Federalist 51. If men were angels, we wouldn’t have a need for government. If we had access to angels to run our government, we wouldn’t need all these rules. But because we are not angels, we don’t have access to them to run our government. We have to have rules, and there have to be limitations on what is and isn’t the role of government.

Now, look, there are all kinds of businesses that keep track of this information on the corporate board members and those considered for those positions and their executives and those considered for those positions. It is not our role to tell them the information they have to extract from each and every person they interview for those positions and demand that it be publicly disclosed. Why? Well, because, among other things, it is none of their darn business, and in many cases, it is none of ours. That is the business of the individual.

We shouldn’t be punishing companies, businesses, and hard-working Americans. Yes, some of them are rich, and a whole lot of them are not rich. We shouldn’t be punishing them just because they don’t happen to share our view of how they ought to be operating.

I find it curious that he says over and over again that this is how they will be more successful and this is how they will make more money. It is not our place to decide. They are free to operate their business in a foolish way and in a way that might cost them money. It doesn’t make it our place to decide this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to be joined by my colleagues as well. I am very grateful to see the Senator from Ohio here.

Thank you so much for being on the floor.

Other colleagues will join to speak this evening on behalf of millions of American families who are struggling to make ends meet and feed their families at this incredibly challenging time.

The COVID-19 crisis is taking a profound toll on our economy and the quality of life of millions of families. As businesses have closed and millions have lost their jobs, the number of people in need of food assistance has soared. Food banks have seen a 70-percent increase in demand—70 percent increase in demand. We have all seen the photos of lines of families in cars stretching on and on for miles, waiting in parking lots with moms and dads, trying to get food for their children.

And even though donations have gone up—we are a generous people in this country—donations have gone up, but the need has far outpaced the funds that are available.

As the pandemic swept across our Nation, one in five adults experienced food insecurity—one in five. More than 3 months later, even more Americans in every State are struggling to put food on the table. These are laid-off workers who lost their jobs due to the pandemic and aren’t sure they will be able to find employment. Many of them need food assistance, and it is for the first time in their life that they need to ask for that help.

These are single moms and dads who are worried about getting their kids fed before they even think about themselves.

These are veterans who are willing to put their lives on the line for the country. Now they are struggling to find work and make rent and just need a little extra help getting the food they need to survive.

These are senior citizens who are at high risk of COVID-19 and have had to make drastic changes to their day-to-day life just to stay safe.

These are children who relied on school meals for breakfast and lunch, possibly after school as well, who have gotten used to the pain of an empty stomach since their school closed.

To these people, hunger is not a partisan issue. It is not a political issue. For them, it is a daily reality that they face. For many of them, SNAP is the vital lifeline that keeps them fed in times of need, and today that need is even greater. If we are looking at the direction of COVID-19 and what is happening across the country, I am concerned, but I think it is realistic to say that the need is going to go even higher.

In any crisis, it is just common sense to make sure affected families have their basic needs met. When I think of my friend from Ohio, who is our champion on housing—we talked about housing as being a basic need. I don’t know anything more basic than a roof over your head and food on the table. Food and housing are pretty basic. We would all suggest that those are things that you start with and that you want for yourself and your family.

When people’s lives are turned upside down through no fault of their own, Americans come together to provide a temporary safety net to help them get back on their feet. That is what the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is, SNAP. It is not there for when folks don’t need it; it is there for when they do need it.

During every past disaster, we have acted to make sure, as Americans, that people don’t go hungry. On a bipartisan basis, we have increased SNAP benefits when families are in need and in cases of natural and economic disasters, like after the 2008 financial crisis.

I do note that my dear friend, the chairman of the Ag Committee—who I

think is on a different side of what we are going to be asking for tonight—he and I have come together over and over again on a bipartisan basis and will continue to do that to work together on these issues.

We provide additional help to people in need. That is the first thing we do. Yet we know that increasing SNAP benefits, in addition to helping people in need, should be No. 1. Put people first—that should be No. 1.

The great news with SNAP is that it also boosts the economy. This is a twofer. According to the USDA, SNAP is one of the best investments we can make. For every dollar we put into SNAP benefits, when somebody walks into the grocery store and buys food, we see roughly \$1.70 more in the economy. It is the most efficient way to help farmers and to help the food industry, is to allow people to have money to buy food for themselves and their kids and for their parents.

We know that every additional billion dollars in SNAP supports nearly 14,000 jobs.

Usually families spend their benefits immediately, so it is very quick. I mean, you don't spend a lot of time—if you are hungry, you are not going to be waiting a couple of weeks before you use your SNAP benefits; you are going to immediately go to the store. That is an immediate economic impact.

When families buy food at grocery stores and markets, as I said, they are strengthening their local economies and the supply chain as a whole, from the farmers to the truckdrivers, to the stockers, to the cashiers, to the folks who invest in the stock markets.

In fact, farmers understand better than anybody that families are their customers. That is why, when we write a bipartisan farm bill, which I am proud that we have been able to do, we make sure it helps both farmers and families.

Farm bills are about a farmer safety net. Farmers need additional help right now. It is also about a family's safety net, and families need help right now. Families across the country need help right now, and this time is no different. Nearly 2,500 farm and food advocates agree with that. In a letter to Senate leadership, these groups, including the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Milk Producers Federation, the National Farmers Union—thousands of organizations—have urged us to increase SNAP benefits for families in need right now with what is happening right now in this crisis.

We are asking for something very simple and very reasonable, a 15-percent boost in SNAP benefits. This increase means an additional \$25 a month per person. That may not seem like much, unless you don't have any food, unless you can't feed your children, unless you are a senior, and you can't get food.

The fact is, it may mean that a mom can actually give her children some

fruits and vegetables so they can stay healthy while they are staying at home through this crisis. It means maybe one less skipped meal at the end of the month. One less skipped meal, that is what we are talking about.

This modest increase will help ensure that families most affected by the pandemic will be able to cover the cost of food while they stay safe, while they look for work, and while they rebuild their lives, which many families are needing to do.

We also need to increase the minimum amount of SNAP from \$16 to \$30 per day. Again, for all of us, that doesn't seem like a lot. The reality is, this may be lifesaving—lifesaving—this difference, especially for our seniors who live alone.

We must also waive the Trump administration's harmful regulations that will take food assistance away from hungry Americans when they need it the most. At a time when our neighbors and our economy are struggling, it is unconscionable to move forward with rules that would cut and deny benefits to millions of Americans, rules that would take away school meals from up to 1 million children.

The Senate has the power to provide quick help to millions of people in every State across the country right now, right now. What a great way to spend a Wednesday evening to be able to help millions of families during this crisis.

This is urgently needed. This is urgently needed help for the millions of families who are wondering where their next meal is going to come from. This is urgently needed help for the millions of people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own in this crisis.

When an unprecedented emergency has put American lives and livelihoods in danger, we have an obligation to act. It is not only our sworn duty; it is the right thing to do. It is just, plainly, the right thing to do.

Boosting SNAP benefits is a tried-and-true, effective way to strengthen the economy and help Americans put food on the table. The U.S. Senate should not look away in the face of so much need.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill to make temporary modifications to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I rise to respond to this unanimous consent request to call up and pass a bill to make modifications to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP.

Over the past few months, through the enactment of both the Families First Act and the CARES Act, Congress has provided both funding and flexibilities for nutrition assistance during this pandemic emergency. The funding from the Families First and CARES Acts has included the following: \$15 billion for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; \$8.8 billion for the School and Child Nutrition Programs; \$1 billion in food distribution programs, like The Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, and the Food Distribution Program for Indian Reservations; \$500 million for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, or the WIC Program.

In addition, Congress provided emergency SNAP benefits, allotments, and pandemic EBT benefits for children while schools are closed.

The Department of Agriculture has been steadily distributing both food and benefits, and the Department has granted and extended many flexibilities to State and sponsoring organizations to get food to those in need.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan, for whom I have a great deal of respect and friendship—we have a history of working together on the Agriculture Committee to help those in need.

In fact, just last week, we wrote the Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, about some of the WIC flexibilities, and the Department of Agriculture has already acted to extend those flexibilities. This is just a recent example of the good work we can accomplish together, but I respectfully object to this unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I agree with my friend from Kansas that we work together in many ways and have been able to get a lot of good things together by working across the aisle. I want to focus on just a couple of things to expound on what he said, though.

While we, in fact, did add dollars for some emergency SNAP in the original Families First Response Act, unfortunately, about 40 percent of the households didn't get any extra help at all. These were our poorest citizens. These were those who were already getting—because their income was so low—the maximum benefit, and they got no help at all. So 40 percent of the folks didn't see anything that was just described, and, for others, we are very concerned about the temporary nature of this and the fact that it was not enough to sustain what is happening for families.

The 15 percent that we are talking about, which is something that was done back during the economic recession and has been done in various ways in the past, is an important response to make sure that every single family and

individual who needs food assistance—not just some but that every single one can get the help they need at this time.

What has been done up to this point was a start. It is surely not enough—surely not enough. At the very beginning of this process, it was not clear how long this was going to go or how deep this was going to go.

The U.S. Senate needs to respond to what we are seeing now and how families are being affected across the country.

I am going to now yield to Senator BROWN and then Senator KLOBUCHAR. I believe I saw her on the floor as well. Yes, Senator KLOBUCHAR and then Senator WYDEN as well—three tremendous advocates.

Thank you so much.

Senator BROWN.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Senator STABENOW, and thank you for introducing this bill and your leadership on all issues agriculture, especially the importance of SNAP and feeding people.

This is the United States of America. One specific thing Senator STABENOW said that really caught me was, it is pretty simple: People should have a roof over their head, and people should have food on the table.

Think if you don't. I don't think that probably most of us know, intimately, people who don't have enough to eat and people who get evicted. I don't think we feel the anxiety they feel every night, wondering about the next meal. Today is July 1, wondering about the rent payment.

Senator KLOBUCHAR said this earlier today; that before the coronavirus, 25 percent of Americans who rent spend more than half their income in rent. So if one thing goes wrong in their life—one thing goes wrong: their car breaks down; they have a problem and their roof leaks; their child gets sick; they get hurt on the job and miss 2 weeks of pay, their life turns upside down.

Do we think about them? Do we think about their anxiety? Apparently not.

Today, this could have been a really, really, really good day for workers in this country—for fast-food workers, for the people who change the linen in hospitals, for custodians, for data entry people, for home care workers—people who are on their feet all day long working for little pay. It could have been a big-deal day. It could be a red-letter day for them because we could have assured them that they will not get evicted; that they will not get foreclosed on if their hours have been cut back or if they are laid off; and we could have assured them that they would get a little food on the table. But under the leadership of Senator MCCONNELL, we don't ever do that.

Senator MCCONNELL's office is back there. I don't know if he ever thinks about people like that. One of my favorite Lincoln quotes is he said: I have to get out of the White House and get my public opinion baths. I have to see

how people are living. I want to hear about people's lives.

I can't imagine Senator MCCONNELL does any of that; otherwise, he couldn't make these awful, hard-hearted decisions to eliminate unemployment when it ends at the end of this month. Maybe he will decide to compromise, but, right now, if you are an unemployed worker, and you can't find a job in Detroit or in Portland or in Eugene or in St. Paul, you wonder if your unemployment is going to just stop, and you are going to get evicted. You don't have enough food, and we don't do a damn thing about it here.

This is the United States of America. Couldn't we help hard-working Americans? Instead, we see an objection to rental assistance. We see an objection to increasing food benefits. I don't get it, the United States of America, that this would possibly happen.

We should take up and pass Senator STABENOW's bill right now to increase SNAP benefits.

At a time when the country is finally focusing on racial injustice, we have to recognize these issues are all connected.

You all know that this pandemic has been the great revealer. It has revealed income inequality. It has revealed racial disparities. It has revealed life expectancies. If you look like me, your life expectancy is a good bit longer than if you are African American or Latino in this country; that our earning power is more and that our educational opportunities are greater. We know all that. Are we doing anything about it here? No, we are not.

The President of the United States has put all of that behind him. He doesn't care about the pandemic. He never mentions the 120,000 people in this country—our brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers and children and grandparents who have died from this. He never mentions them. He has forgotten about that. He just doesn't want it to affect the stock market.

It goes on and on and on. Increased demand at food banks, we hear it all the time. We see the stress on employees and the volunteers at food banks.

Governor DeWine, to his credit—a Republican, and I appreciate that he is doing this—sent the National Guard in to help at food banks. Why? Because many, many food bank volunteers are older, and they couldn't risk getting exposed to so many who are coming in for food. The lines are hours and hours and hours long. Food insecurity rates have doubled since March, almost.

We are realizing why we have a safety net in this country. We are realizing the importance of government. But, apparently, my colleagues, under Senator MCCONNELL and President Trump, don't want to recognize that government has a role in our lives.

The House did its part. It passed the Heroes Act, which has a 15-percent across-the-board increase of SNAP benefits, but, as always, Leader MCCONNELL is standing in the way.

Leader MCCONNELL says no to rental assistance. He says no to helping State and local governments. Wait until the layoffs in Michigan and Ohio and Oregon and Minnesota and North and South Dakota. Wait until the government and the local government layoffs come. Then what are we going to do?

People shouldn't have to always fend for themselves in the middle of a crisis. We should not have people starving or risking their health to get food. People shouldn't be hungry in this country—in this rich country.

It is time for us to step up. It is time to lead where the President has failed. It is time for Senator MCCONNELL to let us do our jobs—debate this; let's pass it; and let's move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator BROWN for his eloquence and advocacy, and I want to thank him also for being an incredibly effective member of the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, as is our next speaker, the senior Senator from Minnesota—two Members that I am so proud to have as partners of mine on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee.

I yield time to Senator KLOBUCHAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Michigan for her leadership on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, helping to pass and leading the last farm bill in the Senate, along with Senator ROBERTS and so many of us who are on that committee.

We understand that rural America is hurting right now, and rural America is actually part of the solution as well for so many people who are hungry and who need help.

This pandemic and its economic impact has left 41 million Americans unemployed and strained the financial security of hundreds of thousands of families across this country.

I have always worked to ensure, from the minute I got on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, that we focus on nutrition. Programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—or, as it is known, SNAP—are the place to do this: to provide meaningful relief to families, children, senior citizens, veterans. People all over this country, people who never thought they would be out of a job, people who used to—and I heard this story in Minnesota—volunteer in food banks, now they are standing in line at food banks because they unexpectedly lost their jobs.

Many of us have seen this. I have visited these food banks. Even before the pandemic, more than 37 million people, including more than 11 million children, were living in a food-insecure household.

Analytics released by the national nonprofit Feeding America in April

projected these numbers to increase this year to more than 54 million people, including 18 million children.

The 350 food shelves in my State operated by Second Harvest Heartland are seeing double or triple the number of visitors. So this weekend, on Sunday, I visited one of our biggest food shelves, Second Harvest Heartland, with Director Allison O'Toole, with a number of people who were working there around the clock. They just released a study. What the study said is that before the pandemic 1 in 11 Minnesotans were living with hunger. Now, they project for August—only a little over a month from now—that one in eight Minnesotans will be food insecure—one in eight.

They said, tracking our State's history back to the Great Depression, they have never seen anything like this since the Great Depression—not even the economic downturn 10 years ago, not the ups and downs in unemployment that we have seen in our rural areas, the farm crises up in Northern Minnesota—nothing like they are projecting to happen.

July begins with the Fourth of July. The Fourth of July is when we celebrate our country. We celebrate what America means. My hope is that we will end July by actually passing the Heroes Act. I know we are going to negotiate it, colleagues. I know we will make changes over what passed in the House, but we cannot let our States go bankrupt. We must help local areas.

I was on the phone today with our friends in the Fargo-Moorhead area, and we have seen it there too. We have seen it all over our State.

The SNAP program was originally designed to respond to changes in the economy by expanding to meet increased need during economic downturns and contracting as economic recovery alleviates the need for food assistance.

Under the farm bill that was signed into law under Senator STABENOW's leadership in 2018, we preserved this critical lifeline. The conference report, which passed with 87 votes in the Senate and 369 votes in the House of Representatives, avoided making cuts to benefits or changes to eligibility that would take away benefits or create obstacles.

At this difficult time, we should ensure that we are getting assistance to all of those who need it, not put up new barriers—not with what we are seeing with more COVID cases in the southern part of this country and in the western part of this country.

In fact, the facts and the numbers bear out that we should be increasing those benefits. The House has taken action to do just that by passing a 15-percent increase in SNAP benefits during the pandemic. That is what they did in the Heroes Act. That is what we should do here.

At the same time, the middle of a pandemic is the wrong time to be cutting SNAP benefits or kicking partici-

pants out of the program, and that is why I have called on the administration to withdraw rules that would take these benefits away from families in need.

As for food deserts, again, the pandemic has simply put a big, fat magnifying glass on a problem that already existed, and that is that 23.5 million Americans live in a food desert where the absence of a grocery store within 1 mile of their home makes it more difficult to purchase fresh, nutritious food.

Low-income Americans and people of color are much more likely to live in a food desert, and people in rural areas live in these food deserts all over America.

That is why Senator BROWN and I wrote a letter with 20 Senators urging the Department of Agriculture to prioritize these programs intended to minimize food deserts and support local and regional efforts for these projects.

We cannot overlook the capacity needs of food shelves, and that is something I talked about with our friends at Second Harvest Heartland just this weekend.

The WORK NOW Act is something that—I appreciate Senator WYDEN is here as one of the cosponsors, along with Senator BROWN and Senator SCHATZ—supports nonprofit organizations, to make it easier for them to hire people who are actually out of work, who could then help other people.

It is why I joined Senator STABENOW and several of my colleagues in the Agriculture Committee in introducing the Food Supply Protection Act to help food banks increase their capacity and strengthen partnerships to prevent food waste while feeding more families.

One of my predecessors, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, whose desk I stand in front of today—his name is carved in the desk—served on the Agriculture Committee. He grew up in a small town in South Dakota. He became a professor eventually, but his father was a pharmacist. He understood the importance—growing up in that family, seeing the ups and downs of rural America—of stable government policy for both agriculture producers and families struggling to put food on the table.

He was a leading advocate of Federal nutrition programs and played an instrumental role in the passage of what was then called the Food Stamp Act of 1964, which turned what was then just a pilot program into the permanent program we know today.

He knew that the moral test of government is how government treats its most vulnerable citizens: those in need, those who are seniors, those with disabilities.

He once said this: "We will be remembered not for the power of our weapons but for the power of our compassion, our dedication to human welfare."

In these times of uncertainty and with rising food insecurity, we need to work to ensure that the nutrition needs of our most vulnerable citizens are met.

I yield the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend from Minnesota for her wonderful words. Again, we think about all the need that is there, and we are here just trying to make sure that people can get their basics, such as food on the table for the kids.

We are very fortunate, and I feel very fortunate to have both Senators from Oregon here on the floor this evening. I am going to first yield now to Senator WYDEN, but I want to say first: Senator WYDEN is the ranking member of the Finance Committee, as we know. I think that is a pretty powerful committee, and we are grateful for his leadership.

I am particularly grateful for the work the Senator is doing and has done on unemployment compensation and what needs to be done and the importance of tying all of this together—for somebody having enough income to be able to pay the rent and then getting enough help to put food on the table.

I am proud to be his partner and very much appreciate all that he is doing to put people first—Senator WYDEN.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank Senator STABENOW, my seatmate on the Senate Finance Committee. We are a bit more socially distant now, but we still have spent this time plotting and thinking and trying to imagine a future that provides the kinds of priorities that we have been talking about today.

Senator STABENOW's reports particularly—these wonderful reports that document the cost of inaction—I have almost made them a reference tool on my desk so, when I have to look at a particular area, I can turn to one of those Stabenow reports. They are always understandable, always cutting right to the heart of the issue, which is this: How are you going to give the opportunity for everybody in America to get ahead—not just the people at the top but everybody in America the chance to get ahead?

I am not going to take but a few minutes. I do want to note that I believe that Oregon is the only State to have produced 100 percent of its U.S. Senators on behalf of the cause tonight. This is something Senator MERKLEY and I enjoy doing when there is an opportunity to speak for justice.

I want to reflect for a minute on how the day started, because I guess it was almost 12 hours ago our Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, stood right there; I stood where I am; and he outlined the Schumer-Wyden proposal for the next steps on dealing with this crushing unemployment we have in our country—30 million people.

The number is almost so large that the experts can't get their arms around exactly how many people are unemployed, but what we know is that every

week it goes up far more than that kind of similar period during the great recession.

We talked about what is going to happen July 31. July 31, if the Senate does not act, we are going to have a tsunami of evictions. We are going to have families, just as Senator STABENOW said, basically sitting in their living rooms, sitting in their kitchens, and trying to figure out how they are going to make ends meet that month.

Without supercharged unemployment, without the SNAP benefits that Senator STABENOW is talking about, without the help Senator BROWN is talking about with respect to housing and evictions, there are a lot of people who are just going to fall between the cracks.

I thought, it being 12 hours since we began this, that I might just connect the dots for a few minutes.

In the face of this historic public health emergency, we know that millions of Americans have their health on the line, and because Donald Trump has failed to get the COVID-19 virus under control, we have now got jobs on the line. Now many people are being forced to choose between feeding their child or paying the rent to keep a roof over their head.

So you have housing, you have healthcare, you have unemployment, and we are trying very hard to be creative. I know, for my colleague from Michigan, hardly a day goes by when she doesn't talk to me about the benefit of Work Share, a creative way to make unemployment dollars stretch. By the way, Senator MERKLEY talks about it almost as much as my friend from Michigan because he feels very strongly about it.

So as we connect the dots, as we have over the last 12 hours, and we talk about housing and healthcare and unemployment, I also want people to understand that those challenges were serious last week and the week before.

We ought to put in context what we heard yesterday from Tony Fauci, who said that the trajectory as of right now is one where our country may possibly see 100,000 new cases a day.

So let's picture what that means for the SNAP program and how hard Senator STABENOW's work is going to be, because we have heard Chairman ROBERTS—and you all have worked very well—and the like, and hopefully we can get that worked out because I don't even want to begin to imagine how much hunger and unemployment and housing challenges we are going to face with 100,000 new cases a day.

So the work that Senator STABENOW is doing is urgent business. It really also brings us back to this: How can it be, in a country as strong and as good as ours, that we have all these kids going to bed hungry at night?

In our home State—the State Senator MERKLEY and I have the privilege to represent—one out of every four Oregonians worries about putting food on the table. Our Oregon Food Bank, run

by the inimitable Susannah Morgan, is doing a fabulous job. But the fact is—and I was really struck by this—the Oregon Food Bank has told my office that demand for emergency food has doubled in Oregon over the past 2 months at Oregon Food Bank's five branches.

Recently, I was home. Whenever Senator MERKLEY and I are home, we try to get out and talk to a variety of community groups. I was helping distribute food baskets. I was struck because we were all being socially distant. They were handing me the bags, and I was putting them in the back of the cart. I got a chance to have a little bit of a conversation with those people. The cars were backed up for blocks and blocks on the east side of our community, where Senator MERKLEY and I both live.

There were people who had not faced this kind of challenge before. You looked at them, and they looked at you, and you could see in their faces that they never expected this, particularly the seniors.

My colleague has heard all the Gray Panthers stories. Senator MERKLEY heard them 50 times; you only heard them 25 times. But a lot of those seniors going through in their cars, it was clear, also, that was the big outing for the day. They didn't get really dressed up, but kind of, and the car was perfectly clean. They came through, and they wanted to visit. But you knew that, without that food, they wouldn't have a chance to make it through the day.

What this comes down to is what Senator STABENOW is basically doing, is being in the Tikkun Olam business. That is a phrase Jews often use; it is about perfecting the world. It is about the moral obligation we have in America to do everything within our power to make sure that kids and families do not go hungry. Susannah Morgan was real clear about the things she wanted Senator MERKLEY and I to talk about on the floor of the Senate and make sure they got out. She wants to make sure that people can get assistance through a regular EBT card.

The Trump administration, of course, has pushed to impose strenuous work requirements, which don't make any sense—particularly in a public health crisis—in workplaces and can be dangerous. We want to expand ways to get food to SNAP participants, like home delivery, curbside pickup. We want to extend what has come to be known as the pandemic EBT through the summer and any future school closures.

This is so important because, even before the pandemic, I often would go to various kinds of programs run by community groups, and they would be serving a lunch. I would shoot baskets with kids for a bit. I would see the kids drift away, and they would take at least two lunches—at least two. I would go and visit. It was clear that they were just ravenous; they were incredibly hungry. This was pre-COVID. I would ask: What did you have to eat

since you were here yesterday to shoot baskets with a Senator?

They would look at you and say: Well, I had a Milky Way.

That is what we are dealing with in America right now. What Senator STABENOW is doing with these programs is so incredibly important. When we have our priorities straight, kids who are eligible for free or reduced-cost meals would be able to get that food. I know that my colleague from Michigan has worked hard to make sure that those meals include more fresh fruits and vegetables. I heard her talk about it. She is trying to reach out to so many communities where often—and Senator KLOBUCHAR talked about it—it is kind of a food desert. If you don't have the program Senator KLOBUCHAR is working for, you are just going to have a lot of people like those kids I met going hungry.

I am going to close with one last thought that is important to us in our part of the country. The reality is that, for many years, none of this was at all partisan. We have all heard about Bob Dole and George McGovern and the history books, and they made their common cause with respect to agriculture, and they would round up urban legislators. We read about that, various historical figures from the East, they weren't partisan.

In our part of the world, when we talk about the practical, commonsense ideas that Senator STABENOW is offering for feeding hungry people, we just call them the Oregon Way. People always ask: Well, where is this Oregon Way, Ron? Where is this thing? Is it on the top of the capitol dome or Pioneer Square in Portland? I say: No, it is what we have tried to do for years.

I want to thank Senator STABENOW for bringing heart and a pragmatic approach to this. We saw how you just reached out to Senator ROBERTS. By the way, I am on the Intelligence Committee. I am not going to give out anything classified, but Senator ROBERTS walked by, and he said: We are going to get this worked out. We are going to figure this out.

I am going to end on a little bit of an upbeat note because that happened maybe only half an hour ago, and having watched my seatmate in action with Chairman ROBERTS often pull together agreements where nobody thought an agreement was possible—no pressure, don't feel like we are singling you out, but just know that a lot of us are going to be your allies in this fight because it is a fight for fairness, it is a fight for kids, it is a fight for families that are hurting, and it is a fight for an America where everybody gets a chance to get ahead.

Thank you for doing that.

Ms. STABENOW. I am going to yield to Senator MERKLEY in a second. First, I want to say to the senior Senator from Oregon, when you talk about the Oregon Way, this needs to be the American way. This is the American way.

Right now, the average food benefit under SNAP is \$4.17 a day for a person.

Think about going to the grocery store—\$4.17 a day. We are asking for a 15-percent increase during this pandemic. We ought to all be looking at these numbers and going: Come on, the America way ought to be to make sure somebody can put food on the table for the children and that they are not eating a Milky Way until they can get to school.

I am going to now turn to Senator MERKLEY. I want to give a shout-out to Senator MERKLEY, who is the ranking Democrat on the Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations, extremely important. He is such a wonderful partner and advocate on all of the food access issues and healthy food issues and so on. We are so lucky to have Senator MERKLEY in the position that he is in. I will turn to Senator MERKLEY.

I yield time to Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in colloquy with my colleague from Michigan.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Senator STABENOW, it is a pleasure to be here with you in this fight for something as fundamental as hunger. As I was listening to the conversation, your words and our colleague's from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN, who was speaking, and our colleague from Minnesota and partner from Oregon, I thought: How many Senators have experienced hunger this last week, the inability to have a meal? What is your sense of that?

Ms. STABENOW. My guess would be that everyone is like me, and, no, I have not experienced a sense of it.

Mr. MERKLEY. No one in this Chamber is missing a meal.

Ms. STABENOW. We are all extremely fortunate; we don't have to experience that.

Mr. MERKLEY. I am pretty sure, down the hall in the House of Representatives, nobody is missing a meal; yet so many people in each of our States are missing meals. In my State of Oregon, hunger has doubled since March. I imagine hunger has increased in your home State of Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Absolutely—at least doubled, absolutely.

Mr. MERKLEY. It is being driven by massive unemployment. The estimate in April was for families who earn less than \$40,000 a year, 40 percent had lost their job. I think that was April. Now, maybe it is well over 50 percent. Half of working America of modest incomes lost their jobs, and it wasn't that easy to sign up for unemployment benefits.

We still have a couple hundred thousand people in Oregon who are waiting for unemployment benefits. I can guarantee you they are very hungry. I know there are those in Michigan as well.

The majority leader has decided to send the Senate on vacation for 2 weeks. I guess my question to you is:

Does hunger take a vacation? Do those who are hungry in Oregon and hungry in Pennsylvania, is it going to take a vacation for 2 weeks?

Ms. STABENOW. I don't think hunger ever takes a vacation, if it is in the middle of the night, early in the morning, all the way through the week. I mean, the reality is, when we are here, there are people around this country who are hungry. When Senator MCCONNELL adjourns the Senate for the week and we are not here for the next 2 weeks, people are going to continue to be hungry and probably getting more and more hungry as the economic situation gets worse.

Mr. MERKLEY. We might think of hunger as kind of a temporary discomfort, something you get through, but my understanding is, when children are hungry, when they don't have the basic nutrients on a regular basis, it damages the development of the mind.

Is that something you heard?

Ms. STABENOW. Absolutely.

Mr. MERKLEY. We are talking about millions of American children who are suffering not just discomfort but damage to their minds because they don't have enough to eat. The majority leader is sending us on vacation rather than addressing it.

Thank you to my colleague for coming to the floor, organizing, carrying this forward, the work you do, and authorizing the work the Appropriations Committee does and the funding.

We have got to address this. We have to recognize how bad the situation is, how bad things are nationally. More than 40 million people have lost their jobs; 120,000 people have died. The rate of infections are exploding across the country—and how bad things are in my home State—243,000 people are out of work. We have an unemployment rate of over 14 percent, higher than it was any point in the great recession. Food insecurity and hunger have doubled since March. Food is at the top of the hierarchy of needs for human life.

All we have done is come to the floor and say: Let's help in a pretty modest way with a 15-percent increase—the \$4 and change that the Senator talked about—60 cents? We probably should be doubling it.

But that 15-percent increase in the maximum benefits does make a difference. It makes a difference. Hunger doesn't take a vacation and neither should we.

As Senator STABENOW proposed, we should debate a bill now—pass now a bill. We should effect these changes at this moment and not leave this Chamber until we have gotten the work of the American people done for the most important need any human being has, and that is basic nutrition.

When Martin Luther King was accepting his Nobel Peace Prize, he said that he had “the audacity to believe that people everywhere could have three meals a day for their bodies, education and culture for their minds, and dignity, equality and freedom for their

spirits.” Let this Chamber have the audacity not just to believe that people can have three meals a day but to make it happen.

I am fully in support of your efforts, a full partner on behalf of all those who suffer hunger in the United States, on behalf of every child who wants a basic foundation to thrive here in the United States of America. We are failing in our job. Hunger doesn't take a vacation and neither should the Senate. Let's get the act passed now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend from Oregon for his comments and his ongoing leadership on the Appropriations Committee. It is incredibly important.

Now, I am going to turn to the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. CASEY, and thank him on so many different issues, which range from children and what they need, in terms of healthcare and being able to have the support they need to be able to grow and be successful, all the way up to our older citizens and those in nursing homes, where he is providing such advocacy now as we look at what needs to be done to support our seniors and those in nursing homes.

Thank you for always putting people first and for joining us tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I want to thank the senior Senator from Michigan for her leadership. I will say more about her work in a moment.

We would not be here tonight talking about this program that we know by the acronym, but the words are all important, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—SNAP—what we used to call food stamps. We wouldn't be here without her leadership and those who made food insecurity and anti-hunger initiatives a priority.

This is a program that I believe is core to our responsibility to support American families during this national crisis—the public health crisis and the jobs crisis. This program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, is a lifeline for millions of Americans to access the food they need to survive. I think that is an understatement. As the junior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MERKLEY, just said, this is about life itself. This is about being able to live and being able to survive. No human being can survive without food, and so many go without food on a regular basis. So many others are food insecure, but that doesn't mean they have not felt the pain we are talking about.

I wanted to say just a couple of words about Senator STABENOW because this has been not just an issue for her, not just a program, the SNAP program, and not just a cause of food insecurity, but it has really been a passion for her. Some people are mission-driven in their work. She has been one of those Senators who has been mission-driven to make sure we are doing everything

we can with every opportunity, every budget, every season of the Senate; that we do everything we can to help the most vulnerable.

Someday, many years from now when many of us may not be around, there may be folks who are chronicling or summarizing the history of the Senate on particular issues. I am sure, just as we make reference to work that has preceded us or Senators who have preceded us—I have no doubt when a Senator stands up on this floor years from now, maybe even decades from now, and they talk about the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, if they start to itemize or catalog or list the Senators who had the most profound impact on this program, Senator STABENOW will be one of very few who will be listed in such a chronicle of the advocacy done for the SNAP program.

William Jennings Bryan said a long time ago, in a different context, but he said it well about a cause, about how one person can make such a difference on one issue or one cause. We have seen some of that lately with Americans demanding action on a range of issues—marching and protesting for criminal justice reform or changes to policing or advocates for healthcare or whatever issue, whatever cause. William Jennings Bryan said it well. I think he said it in 1896: “The humblest citizen in all the land, when clad . . . in a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error.”

“When clad . . . in a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error.”

I think what he meant by that is that one citizen can have a huge impact. What we have even with Senator STABENOW's work is one Senator who can have an impact. This has been for her, I know, her righteous cause, and the country is better for her service and better for her work on this issue.

What are we talking about here? When we say food insecurity, that may not sound too threatening to a lot of people. That means you are hungry. The person we are talking about might be an adult, but all too many times it is a child. When a child is hungry, it is hard as an adult to really fully understand what that means. I never lived a day of my life when I was hungry the whole day or the second day or the third day, so I really can't explain it. I never experienced it. I think that is probably true of most Members of Congress. Maybe growing up for some, they were, but many, of course, now don't feel that sense of food insecurity.

It is a devastating reality for tens of millions of Americans. That was the case before the jobs crisis, before the COVID-19 public health crisis. It is ever more so now in the aftermath of the onset of the virus and while we are still in the grip of this COVID-19 disease—what we know and are describing worldwide as a pandemic.

The pandemic has only made this crisis worse. Even more urgent is the crisis of food insecurity and economic insecurity. The unemployment numbers

that we see now are further exacerbating what were already the undeniable realities of hunger, poverty, and food insecurity in this country.

I know, for example, in my home State of Pennsylvania—I haven't seen the May numbers yet, but April numbers were high: 15 percent unemployment, 975,000 people out of work, heading toward a million people out of work in one State. I am certain that number will be lower in May, and thank God for that, and I hope lower in June again.

When you are saying in one State there are hundreds of thousands more on top of the unemployed numbers from March, you can understand the terrible impact. When we talk about unemployment, that often leads to food insecurity, and that may lead to the kind of desperation that hunger can bring. You are talking about real pain in the lives of people—physical pain in an adult but especially in a child who may not be able to articulate the pain they are feeling. They may not be able to function, literally. They may not be able to function in any way. They certainly can't learn in school. No human being can learn and grow if they are hungry all the time—no one, not the strongest person we know.

I come from a heritage of people who left Ireland because of hunger. They called it the Great Hunger at the time. When policies were put in place or actions were not taken and hundreds of thousands of people starved, millions left Ireland, just like people leave their homelands today to escape hunger, to escape poverty, and even famine itself—the most extreme version of hunger around the world.

We are talking about real physical pain. We are not just talking about a casual missing of a meal or being a little bit hungry, as so many of us have never experienced. It is pain, but it is also fear. Imagine the fear of a parent. I can't even begin to imagine as a parent knowing that, for a lot of different reasons—job loss or other adverse circumstances in your life—you cannot afford to feed your children. That one person might have both the pain of hunger and the total fear of not being able to feed your children. If we are not doing something about that in the Senate, we are just not doing our job.

We say: Oh, the CARES Act did this and the CARES Act did that. Well, do you know what? We have been trying for months now, on the Democratic side of the aisle in the Senate, to get a couple of things done.

What are they? No. 1, increase in SNAP benefits by 15 percent. Why can't that be done in the Senate when we know the pain and the reality of hunger? Increase the minimum benefit level. Why can't we do that in the Senate? We passed, what, five bills for \$3 trillion, and we can't add more money to the SNAP program? I know, we did it in an earlier bill. Let's stop patting ourselves on the back for that.

Let's do something transformative or at least do something substantial.

Let's not even get to transformative. Let's get to substantial help for Americans who are hungry right now, folks who are low income and are hungry; folks who had a job and lost their job are hungry. They may benefit from a food pantry or a food bank. We are not doing enough for them either. We are certainly not doing enough for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the most vulnerable among us.

Thirdly, in addition, increase the benefits overall by 15—the minimum benefit level. We should put a stop to the rules the administration has been cramming down the throats of Americans so that less people will get the benefit of the SNAP program. The administration is dead wrong about that. They haven't just doubled down on pushing these draconian changes to the program, but they recently appealed a court ruling that put a temporary pause on one of the rules. I don't know the words for that—heartless, callous—but it is not good for any of us. It is a stain on the moral fabric of America when any administration does that.

I know Senator STABENOW and her colleagues on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee—we should use the middle word more often than we do. It is not simply the Ag Committee. It is the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee. The nutrition part of it has been the subject of some good working relationships on the committee.

I want to thank Senator STABENOW for her work again. I appreciate the work she has done with Senator ROBERTS. We have to do more than we have done on this program.

I was proud a couple of years ago to finally—after attempt after attempt, year after year—finally, to get the Global Food Security Act passed. People have been waiting for that from the time Dick Lugar served in the Senate all the way through the time I teamed up with former Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON.

We got the Global Food Security Act done, which meant that the Feed the Future Program—that great program the Bush administration started and the Obama administration brought to fruition—was codified in law. That was a good day for world food security.

That was a good day for the world when America showed that we know how to do this, that we know how to help countries grow their own food and provide food security. Yet we haven't done enough here. We never can say we have done enough here if we are not funding at an adequate level in the middle of a pandemic, in the middle of a public health emergency, and in a jobs and economic emergency. We can't say we are doing enough if we are not going to invest in SNAP.

I have a lot more to say, but I know I am over my time. Let me make one final point.

The moral case is unassailable here. There is no disputing the benefit of this program, especially now. So I

think the moral question is settled. I just hope folks will consider it.

How about the economic case?

Say that you are a Member of Congress and that you don't like this program. There are not many people who would admit to that, but you don't like it, and you don't want to add more funding to it. That is your position. That is a morally objectionable position, but let's say that is your position. You could also be for an increase to the SNAP program because it is a good bang for the buck, OK?

So if all you are interested in is going back home and saying "Do you know what I did today? I voted for a program that will more than pay for itself, and it will help everybody"—if that is what your game is and if that is what makes you happy, your going back to your community, to your State, then fine. This program, the SNAP program, is a great bang for the buck.

If you spend a buck on SNAP benefits in an economic downturn—and I will make sure I cite the source here. It is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service. Guess what. You will get \$1.50 in return, maybe even as high as \$1.80. Let's go with the current number of \$1.50. That is a pretty good ROI, return on investment.

If that is all you care about, is a return on investment, and you don't care about the program—you are not really troubled by food insecurity, and you are not really persuaded by the pain of hunger—then support it because it is a good bang for the buck. That would make sense. That is the American way to consider what we should be doing here. Consider the moral case, which should be enough, but you can also consider the efficacy of the program—the effect, the value—in an economic sense.

We are all better off when SNAP is funded at an adequate level—all of us—because of that bang for the buck and because when people get SNAP dollars, they spend them. Guess what. That is good for all of us. It is good for our local economies, and it is good for our State economies. It is good for producers, for the people transporting the food, and for the people marketing the food. That is why farmers and people in the ag sector of our economy are sometimes the biggest proponents of the SNAP program.

This is the right thing to do to try to ease some of that pain—that awful pain—that children feel in the middle of the night, in the morning when they wake up, at lunchtime when other kids are eating something and they may not be eating, especially now that they are away from school, at night, and when they go to bed at night.

So let's come together and get something done. There is some good news in that we might be considering another bill, but let's meet our obligation on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. If others who have been re-

luctant to do that vote for this and support this, then you can do all the pats on the back that you want, but let's do the right thing for America, especially for those suffering from the pain of hunger.

I yield the floor to the senior Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his passion and for his being such a wonderful partner on these issues. I very much appreciate his speaking about the fact that there is an economic benefit.

If nothing else, if someone wants to look at how we can help our farmers, how we can help our grocery stores, how we can help those in the food chain—all of whom we want to help as well—you do that in the most efficient way possible, which is by giving people the funds to go buy food directly in the grocery stores so that they are able, when they have a need like this, to support their families.

The great thing about SNAP is that it is set up so that when the economy gets better, the food assistance goes down. When the economy gets worse, the food assistance goes up. The challenge for us right now is that there is such a crisis and there are so many more people needing help—people who never in their lives thought they would need help—that we are in a situation in which we are called upon to meet that need and to be able to increase what we are doing.

There was a small effort at the beginning to provide some additional help, but it nowhere near met the need we have now—nowhere near. When I think about negotiating the CARES Act and the fact that, again, the average benefit for food assistance in this country per person is \$4.17 a day, the White House said no to any increase to the \$4.17 a day. Leader MCCONNELL said no to any increase in the CARES Act—to the \$4.17 a day for people.

There is something wrong with that, so we are here on the floor to say we have to do better. The Senate has to do better. The House did better when it passed the Heroes Act. It gave some additional support and help. The Senate needs to do the same. The Senate could have done the same tonight rather than to now wait 2 weeks, as we will not be in session. We haven't really started negotiating what comes next, and it will take weeks after that.

Every single day, there are people going hungry. The pain that Senator CASEY talked about is something being experienced by people tonight and being experienced by people in the morning and every single day going forward. That is the reality for too many families in America—in the United States of America—and it doesn't have to be that way.

We can at least give some help. I wish we could do more. We couldn't get a 15-percent increase in the CARES

Act. I would love to be able to do more than that, but at a minimum, we should be doing that. That is what the House did. That is what has been done in other economic downturns, and that is what we should be doing to help families in America who, frankly, just want to know somebody has their backs right now when everything is coming at them and when they are trying to figure out how they are going to keep their heads above water and care for their children and make sure that the older adults in their lives have the help and support they need as well.

We are going to keep working on this until we get it. There is just no excuse not to be able to meet the need that so many millions of families are feeling right now.

This is a moral moment for the Senate. It could have been a moral Wednesday. If there had not been an objection, we could have gotten it done tonight. Wouldn't that have been a great way to go into the Fourth of July weekend—being able to provide some small, additional food assistance for millions of Americans who are in need right now? This is not going to happen now because of the objection, but we are going to keep going until we can get families the help they need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

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

RUSSIA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, before we close tonight, I want to talk about a story that is troubling a lot of Americans—one that we have just learned about in the last couple of days—and that is the recent events regarding the U.S. presence in Afghanistan and some of the reporting.

Like many of my colleagues—and I am sure this is a feeling shared by tens and tens of millions of Americans—I am alarmed, as I know they are, by reports of the intelligence community's discovery that the Russian Government offered to pay Taliban and Haqqani Network militants to target American troops in Afghanistan.

The New York Times broke the story on June 26. Since then, several questions have emerged regarding how the intelligence has been handled, how long decisionmakers within the U.S. Government have known about this, and thirdly, what measures the administration is taking to hold Russia accountable.

Obviously, there are a number of stories by other news outlets in addition to that by the New York Times. I will just refer to one excerpt from the New York Times' June 26 report.

It reads: "An operation to incentivize the killing of American and other NATO troops would be a significant and provocative escalation of what American and Afghan officials have

said is Russian support for the Taliban.”

The story later goes on to read: “Any involvement with the Taliban that resulted in the deaths of American troops would also be a huge escalation of Russia’s so-called hybrid war against the United States, a strategy of destabilizing adversaries through a combination of such tactics as cyberattacks . . . and covert and deniable military operations.”

We have learned in recent days that these reports have been circulating through the U.S. intelligence community since early 2019, but there was little to no action taken. The timeline regarding these events is of particular concern to me and, I know, to many Americans but especially to those who represent a State in which there is a direct connection.

In April of 2019, three U.S. marines were killed in a car bomb near Bagram Airfield in Afghanistan. There was speculation that this may have been a bounty attack that had been carried out by the Taliban for the Russians.

There has been further reporting on this—tracking the dollars—by the New York Times and maybe by a few other outlets, but I know the New York Times did.

One of the marines killed in that April 2019 attack was a Pennsylvanian. If there had been credible intelligence regarding the Russian plot and if that intelligence had been acted upon, one question I have is—and it is only a question; I don’t know the answer to this question, but I ask it—could the death of this young Pennsylvania marine and his brothers in arms have been averted?

That is a question. I don’t know the answer to it. I hope, in the coming days and weeks—and I hope not longer than weeks—we will have an answer to that question, among many, as it troubles so many Americans.

As of the close of last year, December of 2019, 294 servicemembers from Pennsylvania had been killed in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—the third highest toll of any State. Our State has sacrificed a lot. If Russia had had any hand in contributing to these losses, to say that it is offensive, enraging, and deeply problematic is an understatement and warrants a close look not only at the U.S. engagement in Afghanistan but also at how we respond—how the United States of America responds—to Vladimir Putin’s efforts to disrupt U.S. efforts overseas and take American lives while doing it.

Accordingly, I have several questions about how the intelligence has been handled and what measures have been taken to hold Russia accountable for these horrific, incendiary, unlawful actions contrary to international law.

The administration must brief all Members of Congress immediately. I think Americans are offended when the administration briefs one side of the aisle. All Members of Congress should be briefed. Those briefings should occur

immediately and in close proximity to the reporting. The briefings should include when they received the intelligence—when the administration received it—when the President was briefed, and what actions were considered in response. I also call on the administration to report to Congress on a process for protecting our troops in moving forward.

You could be justifiably offended by inaction by the administration or for the knowledge that preceded that inaction, that they did nothing in response to it.

It is especially offensive now to a lot of Americans that this information now is in the public record and there seems to be no evidence of any kind of a response, any kind of an action.

So I think the administration should report to Congress not just on who knew what when, but also on what we do going forward.

The families of these fallen soldiers deserve answers. The American people, obviously, deserve answers as well.

We cannot let Russia and Vladimir Putin get away with this.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I want to thank all my colleagues and my partners, my partner Senator REED, for working so hard today to come to an agreement. It has been a tough day. We think we have created a package that is acceptable to everyone and we will be hotlining it tonight.

The Senate will come back into session at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning, and hopefully, we will be able to lock in our deal here.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to clarify a point concerning my amendment No. 2270 to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021, S. 4049. This amendment would establish in law the position of the Special Envoy for Hostage Affairs at the State Department and provides that the Special Envoy shall have the rank and status of ambassador. Under article II of the Constitution, the

President’s power to appoint ambassadors is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. Accordingly, it is my view that the appointment of the Special Envoy with the rank and status of ambassador, pursuant to this amendment, requires the advice and consent of the Senate.

FOURTH OF JULY

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about our Nation’s independence.

Some 244 years ago this Saturday, the Founding Fathers of this country voted to declare our independence from Great Britain.

All Americans know the basics of this story, but not everyone knows the story behind one of our Nation’s founding documents.

Thomas Jefferson was just 33 years old when the Second Continental Congress commissioned him to draft a declaration of independence. When he sat down in a rented room in the heat of the Philadelphia summer to write it, the American Revolution had already begun.

On one level, he was simply putting the reasons for independence into words. The first shot had been fired over a year earlier, after decades of increasingly tyrannical British abuses had culminated in open revolt in Massachusetts.

Even so, it was not yet clear whether the delegates from all 13 colonies would put their names to a formal document declaring our independence. They had to be persuaded.

After 17 days of writing and rewriting, struggling to find the right words, Jefferson presented his work to Benjamin Franklin and John Adams. He then submitted a draft to the Congress on July 1, which officially adopted it three days later.

Each year on the Fourth of July, we celebrate this moment—the moment that we declared our independence from the British Empire and began to see ourselves as our own nation.

I love Independence Day celebrations in Nebraska. Like many people, my family often spends the day enjoying the great outdoors before hosting friends and neighbors for a barbecue.

But the Fourth of July is about more than food and fireworks or parades and pancake feeds. It is an opportunity to reflect on the nearly two and a half centuries of our nation’s history and remember what it means to be an American.

To me, America is a nation based on an idea. It is the idea, as Jefferson wrote, that “all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”

Belief in this creed is what unites us as Americans. And while we may not always live up to this idea, we can never stop trying. We should count ourselves fortunate to live in the greatest nation on earth, where the notion

of equal justice for all first came into the world.

I was touched to see that on June 22, 36 people became American citizens in the first naturalization ceremony held in Lincoln since February. This diverse group of people renounced their loyalty to their former countries and took an oath of allegiance to the United States. Family and friends in attendance brought homemade banners, red, white, and blue balloons, and other patriotic displays.

These 36 people, despite being citizens for only a few weeks, are just as American as you or me. And these new citizens chose to be Americans. They weren't born here, but they saw America for what it is: a shining city upon a hill, where our institutions, though they sometimes falter, strive to honor Jefferson's promise of God-given rights and equal treatment before the law for all citizens.

We are not perfect, but neither can we forget our founding purpose. The United States was the first nation in history to set this lofty standard for ourselves, and we remain its best example.

This Independence Day, as our country wrestles with both a pandemic and national unrest in the wake of the killing of George Floyd, I urge you to remember that we remain, as President Abraham Lincoln said during the Civil War, "the last best hope of earth."

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING MARNY XIONG

• Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I rise to honor the life of Marny Xiong, who served as chair of the St. Paul school board and was a beloved member of the community taken from us too soon on June 7, 2020. As one person put it, Marny wasn't just well-liked, she was well-loved.

Those who knew Marny best described her as someone with a joyful spirit who was great at making other people laugh. Mayor Melvin Carter of St. Paul may have said it best when he noted that she "embodied our city's spirit, gave her heart to our students, and worked tirelessly to uplift the voices of the unheard."

The daughter of Hmong refugees whose parents fled Laos to a refugee camp in Thailand before arriving in Minnesota, Marny and her eight siblings grew up in St. Paul and attended St. Paul public schools. Her father earned a high school diploma as an adult, opening career opportunities for him and showing Marny firsthand the value of education and hard work.

Marny Xiong represented the best of us, driven by a simple mission to do good and to give back. As the chair of the St. Paul School Board, she demanded equity for her students—and fought for justice for all people across

our State. During the Covid-19 pandemic that sadly took her life, she took on the fight against hate crimes against Asian Americans and hateful rhetoric about the virus. She stood up against these acts of hate that threatened the lives and dignity of so many in Minnesota.

Marny led St. Paul's school board and Asian American elected officials in condemning xenophobia and denouncing racism, saying: "While they brew hate, we're building a powerful movement for change." Marny understood that there are more students to help, more teachers to respect, more communities to support, and more justice to deliver. Marny wasn't afraid or intimidated to take on these challenges. She was resolute and determined to enlighten those who engage in the politics of fear and division. That is Marny's legacy and what we have inherited from her.

Marny Xiong is a role model and an inspiration and will be sorely missed, but as we mourn her loss today, tomorrow we can honor Marny's legacy by building on the movement to which she committed her life, a movement to see a better, more just, vision of our communities and our country, Marny's movement.

Thank you.●

RECOGNIZING AMWAT MOVING WAREHOUSING STORAGE

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. Today, it is my distinct honor to recognize a family-owned business that not only provides excellent moving, warehousing, and storage services but also prioritizes dignified work for its employees. This week, it is my pleasure to honor AMWAT Moving Warehousing Storage of Tallahassee, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

AMWAT was founded in 1997 by college sweethearts Dean and Gloria Pugh in Tallahassee, FL. After helping several friends move residences, the couple realized they had the potential to start their own business. Initially named "A Man With A Truck," the business started as a one-man operation consisting of a pick-up truck and trailer operating out of Dean's spare bedroom. Soon after, A Man With a Truck moved into a small warehouse, hired six employees and acquired three moving trucks.

In 2008, Dean and Gloria acquired the largest, oldest moving company in the Tallahassee area and rebranded as AMWAT Moving Warehousing Storage. AMWAT has grown to include 26 employees and a 13-truck fleet. They provide long-term storage, handle shipping for local businesses, and provide shipping services nationwide. Gloria serves as president and chief executive officer and Dean is the chief operating officer.

AMWAT's high-quality work has earned awards from business groups, including the Greater Tallahassee Chamber of Commerce, the Tally Awards, Angie's List, and Wheaton World Wide Moving. Dean and Gloria are also active in the American Moving and Storage Association and the Professional Movers Association of Florida.

From the beginning, Dean and Gloria have understood that providing dignified work is crucial to personal and community development. Through training, mentorship, and teamwork, they encourage their employees to feel a sense of ownership in the company and take pride in their work. At AMWAT, the employees are the most valued asset.

Locally, AMWAT is committed to addressing poverty, upward mobility, education, and the arts. Their signature charity event is the annual Summer Fill-a-Truck Food and Fund Drive, which benefits the Second Harvest of the Big Bend. They have also partnered with ECHO, Junior League of Tallahassee, and LeMoyné Arts.

Like many other small businesses, AMWAT experienced a sharp decline in revenue due to the coronavirus pandemic. When the U.S. Small Business Administration launched the Paycheck Protection Program, PPP, Gloria and Dean quickly applied. The PPP provides forgivable loans to impacted small businesses and nonprofits who maintain their payroll during the COVID-19 pandemic. When their funding was approved, Gloria and Dean used it to keep their 26 employees paid and adapt their business procedures to meet public safety standards. For Gloria and Dean, the PPP was a "blessing" and a "godsend," providing the security needed to continue serving their customers, employees, and community.

AMWAT Moving Warehousing Storage is an outstanding example of the important role small businesses play in creating dignified work in their communities. I commend AMWAT for providing excellent moving, storage, and logistical services and uplifting their employees. Congratulations to Dean, Gloria, and the entire team at AMWAT. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY CONTEST FINALISTS

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD some of the finalist essays written by Vermont High School students as part of the 10th annual "State of the Union" essay contest conducted by my office.

The material follows:

SAMUEL DOOLEY, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL,
SENIOR

The country that we live in today is plagued with fundamental problems. Ranging from political corruption to an inefficient healthcare system, yet the single most important issue facing our country today is nationwide environmental neglect. Without

extreme actions being taken immediately, more irreversible damage will be done.

In 2018, the United States emitted 6.5 billion metric tons of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. This is an estimated 8.8% more than 1990. Between 1990 and 2010, the United States lost 949,750 acres of forest on average per year. The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that 1.9 million gallons of oil are spilled into U.S. oceans every year.

Current studies show that the effects of climate change are more severe and are moving faster than was formerly predicted. What needs to happen is large scale environmental programs with legal incentives such as tax breaks, as well as punishments for not adhering to the plans like jail time and loss of government funding or subsidies. The most accurate proposal of recent years is the Green New Deal. This proposal called for a World War 2 type mobilization of the country to achieve 100% clean energy by 2030. This plan also looked to better the economy by creating jobs in sustainable industries, unlike jobs currently involved in fossil fuel industries, as well as investing in renewable public transportation and clean organic agriculture. The first step to combating climate change would be to immediately adopt this proposal, yet in March of 2019 the proposal was rejected by a Republican controlled Senate.

The very first step that should be taken is the readmittance of the U.S. into the Paris Climate Agreement. It is the duty of the United States to set an example for the rest of the world about how to combat climate change. An important idea is to make environmental agencies as nonpartisan as possible, similar to the NLRB where the members consist of nearly equal Republicans as well as Democrats at all times. This would ensure that decisions are made based on science instead of based on party ties and political affiliations.

The most important goal being to make the United States completely carbon neutral. A plan for most, if not all, energy produced to come from clean sources would be necessary to achieving that goal. Another necessity would be the implementation of programs designed to restore forests and wildlife. This would mean increased regulation on logging industries as well as oil industries. With an increased punishment for violating these regulations. These initiatives would be able to transition Americans losing their jobs in fossil fuel industries into clean energy industries, which would be a sustainable alternative. Green jobs would have higher job security than fossil fuels due to the fact that there is a finite amount of coal and oil available to be extracted, once the planet no longer has these resources available all of these millions of workers will lose their jobs with no replacement. With a program like the Green New Deal, these workers will have jobs that do not have an expiration date. It is important to remember that those first and most heavily affected by this crisis, are people with lower incomes. This is not only an environmental issue, but also a human rights issue.

It is up to all of us now to be able to preserve this planet and create a stable system which will allow all generations moving forward to prosper in a healthy environment.

MEREDITH JACKSON, BURLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, FRESHMAN

One issue in Vermont that doesn't get enough recognition is the cost of eating healthy. It isn't affordable for many, and the expenses can even discourage people to eat healthily. If the prices are discouraging people to eat healthily, then they might resort to unhealthy foods because they are cheaper and in more of the average price range for most.

Healthy Living and City Market both have a goal to provide local farm-fresh produce including prep items for healthy, nourishing, meals, and a selection of ingredients to cook vegan or gluten-free meals. Healthy living and City Market are great in that they provide fresh local produce, and for the quality that it is the prices make sense. On the Healthy Living website, the price for a container of raspberries can range anywhere from \$4.29–\$5.69. That may not seem like a lot but at McDonald's, you can get an entire meal for that much. That is just what many people choose to do, resort to cheaper options such as fast food.

Unlike fresh produce and wholegrain-rich foods, fast food is quick, easy, and very cheap, making it ideal for people who can't afford to shop at places like city Market or Healthy living.

According to Gallup, 80% of Americans eat fast food on at least a monthly basis, and 96% of Americans eat fast food annually. Fast food isn't bad unless a person has it often, say at least once a week. Eating unhealthy foods, too often, can cause people to become overweight or even obese. Over 99,000,000 adults in the U.S. are overweight and over 70,000,000 are obese.

Obesity can cause many health issues that could have been prevented if that person were of a healthy weight. Some risks include high blood pressure, diabetes, gout, breathing problems, such as sleep apnea and asthma, Gallbladder disease and gallstones, Osteoarthritis, Heart disease, stroke, and even cancer. Maintaining a healthy weight and lifestyle will reduce the risk of many of these health problems.

It's not guaranteed that people become obese overtime because healthy food is too expensive, eating unhealthily isn't the only factor that causes obesity, but it could very well be. If healthier foods were cheaper, it would be an option for more people and would encourage them to eat healthier reducing the risk of obesity. Having the availability of healthy meals is important.

A healthy diet is beneficial to your everyday life in so many ways. Some benefits to eating healthy are a maintained/healthy weight, reduced risk of chronic illnesses such as cardiovascular disease and cancer, more energy, and an increase in happiness. Also, a recent study has proven that having a diet consisting of plenty of fruits and vegetables and limits highly processed food, can reduce certain signs of depression.

This issue is very real and very important but thinking up solutions to this problem can be quite the challenge. There are a few solutions that seem doable and not too far-fetched or unrealistic.

First, expanding the fresh produce area in stores like Hannafords to give more options and kind of push out some of the unhealthy, overly processed items in the store. This wouldn't necessarily make it less expensive but having more options might encourage people to shop in that section more often.

Second, doing some more advertising for the Farm Share Program. The Farm Share Program provides limited-income Vermonters with access to high-quality produce on a weekly basis. The program helps hundreds of families get access to a season's worth of farm-fresh produce by reducing the cost of the shares. The program itself is already a solution to this problem, but I feel like advertising would be good because it would inform more people that they have that option. All they have to do is sign up.

Third, and last, is more of something people could do themselves or with a group of people, but people could start their own gardens or start a larger neighborhood garden. This would provide people with plenty of

fresh fruits and vegetables. All they would have to do is chip in a little hard work and time, then they could have all the free produce that was grown.

Eating healthy is expensive because a lot of work goes into growing, and getting, that local farm-fresh produce into stores. Farmers spend countless hours growing the crops from which it all comes from, people need to pick, sort, and wash everything, then, there is packaging and delivering. The list goes on. Another part is due to the fact that it is high quality, locally grown, and fresh. A lot of money goes into providing it, so a lot of money needs to be made in order for them to keep providing the produce to stores for everyone. The problem is big, the solutions are limited, but something needs to be done in order to provide farm-fresh products to the people of Vermont at a more reasonable and affordable price.

CALEB MATOSKY, RICE MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

As citizens of one of the wealthiest nations in the world, we have an inherent responsibility to set an example for others to follow. America has failed to take action and address what is perhaps the greatest threat our world has faced since the beginning of recorded history: climate change. If Americans continue to deny its effects, the future of our country will be put into jeopardy. Rising sea levels, more severe weather events, rampant wildfires, devastating droughts, and disappearing winters are just a few of the effects of climate change we are already experiencing. Skeptics and deniers might argue that America is taking enough action to fight global warming: this sort of lazy and selfish thinking is what has caused the American people and our government to allow climate change to occur uninhibited until the very end of the last century. If our government does not make drastic changes within the next several years, America as we know it could be forever changed. We have the money, we have the ability to implement changes, and all that remains is for lawmakers to place the future of our planet over their allegiance to fossil fuels.

I propose widespread legislation to ensure that America is powered by 80% renewable energy by 2030, which would be a large step in the right direction for the future of our planet. We need to penalize those who profit off of destroying the environment through fossil fuels, as these energy producers produce more emissions per day than many people produce in a year. Through new laws which put a price on CO2 emissions, and government tax relief for those who produce renewable power, we can work to rid the earth of harmful coal burning. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, coal fueled power generation produces 1.15 billion tons of CO2 each year. It is also the most carbon rich fossil fuel, producing 2.5 tons of CO2 per ton of coal burned. Despite this, coal is still being used as the primary source of energy in America. This needs to change. Additionally, we need to take action to crack down on other nations who disregard the state of the world's climate, and ensure that nations such as China and India take responsibility for their role in the issue.

The United States is the wealthiest nation in the world, and if only a fraction of our military budget was used to invest in the future of our environment, the future of younger generations and the future of our species as a whole we might be able to prevent many of climate change's worst effects. There is no time left to wait, or to deny the challenges before us: we must take urgent action and do everything we can to lower CO2 emissions before it is too late.●

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

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President Pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY) announced that on today, July 1, 2020, he has signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 4091. An act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for fiscal year 2020 for increased payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries, and for other purposes.

At 5:51 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 4116. An act to extend the authority for commitments for the paycheck protection program and separate amounts authorized for other loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7440. An act to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons involved in the erosion of certain obligations of China with respect to Hong Kong, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 1, 2020, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 4091. An act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for fiscal year 2020 for increased payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-4937. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4938. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Conditional Approval and Disapproval; Arizona; Maricopa County; Power Plants, Fuel Burning Equipment, and Internal Combustion Engines" (FRL No. 10009-81-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4939. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; California; Mariposa County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 10010-73-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4940. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Jefferson County Performance Tests" (FRL No. 10010-78-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4941. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Revisions; California; Technical Amendments" (FRL No. 10011-00-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4942. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality State Implementation Plan Approval; Nevada; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 10011-07-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4943. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Redesignation of the Inland Sheboygan, Wisconsin Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standards" (FRL No. 10011-17-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4944. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Maricopa County Air Quality Department and Pima County Department of Environmental Quality" (FRL No. 10011-25-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on

June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4945. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Miscellaneous Permit Provisions Revisions" (FRL No. 10011-31-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4946. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Negative Declaration for the Oil and Gas Industry; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule" (FRL No. 10011-42-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4947. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; Connecticut; Determination of Clean Data for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the Greater Connecticut Area" (FRL No. 10011-52-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4948. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Long-Chain Perfluoroalkyl Carboxylate and Perfluoroalkyl Sulfonate Chemical Substances" (FRL No. 10010-44-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4949. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning amendments to Part 126 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4950. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, a report concerning a final rule that removes Department regulations that govern the obsolete Walsh Visa Program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4951. A communication from the Board of Trustees, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2020 Annual Report on the Financial Status of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4952. A communication from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Actuarial Report Required by Section 22 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 and Section 502 of the Railroad Retirement Solvency Act of 1983; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4953. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4954. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Board's compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4955. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans: Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4956. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Visas: Special Immigrant Visas - U.S. Government Employee Special Immigrant Visas for Service Abroad" (RIN1400-AE77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4957. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Regulations Related to Immigrant Visas for Certain Expatriates" (RIN1400-AE55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4958. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Policy, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program" (RIN2126-AC02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Report to accompany S. 3051, a bill to improve protections for wildlife, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-239).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Katherine A. Crytzer, of Tennessee, to be Inspector General of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

*Beth Harwell, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2024.

*Brian Noland, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2024.

By Mr. RUBIO for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

*Peter Michael Thomson, of Louisiana, to be Inspector General, Central Intelligence Agency.

*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. CRUZ:

S. 4119. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4120. A bill to enhance the early warning reporting requirements for motor vehicle manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 4121. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a motor vehicle recall assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 4122. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a final rule revising motor vehicle seat back safety standards; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 4123. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct research regarding and require the use of driver monitoring systems to minimize or eliminate motor vehicle driver distraction; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 4124. A bill to expedite hiring by the Department of Veterans Affairs of medical department personnel separating from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 4125. A bill to extend the paycheck protection program and to provide supplemental loans to recipients of loans under the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 4126. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 104 East Main Street in Port Washington, Wisconsin, as the "Joseph G. Demler Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 4127. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to modify the treatment of revenue from timber sale contracts and certain payments made by counties to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior under good neighbor agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 4128. A bill to extend the authority for the establishment by the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation of a commemorative work to commemorate the mission of the Peace Corps and the ideals on which the Peace Corps was founded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 4129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. JONES, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 4130. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to award grants to States for the construction of microelectronics manufacturing and advanced research and development facilities, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to fund the construction of microelectronics manufacturing facilities for national security needs, and to authorize additional amounts for microelectronics research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 4131. A bill to make high-speed broadband internet service accessible and affordable to all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 4132. A bill to establish the Commission on the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4133. A bill to modernize the REAL ID Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 4134. A bill to establish a demonstration project to increase access to biosimilar products under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 4135. A bill to provide forgivable physical disaster loans to businesses damaged due to civil unrest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 4136. A bill to require Federal agencies to conduct a benefit-cost analysis on relocations involving the movement of employment positions to different areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4137. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make adjustments to payment rates for skilled nursing facilities under the Medicare program to account for certain unique circumstances; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4138. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make permanent the authority of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to conduct a telework travel expenses program; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 4139. A bill to encourage support by international financial institutions for a robust global response to the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 4140. A bill to provide additional emergency funding for certain nutrition programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4141. A bill to refinance Federal and private student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN (for Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. WARREN)):

S. 4142. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes to remove the defense of qualified immunity in the case of any action under section 1979, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4143. A bill to extend the unemployment insurance provisions of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act for the duration of the economic recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 4144. A bill to amend the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act with respect to sport fish restoration and recreational boating safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 4145. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit retail businesses from refusing cash payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 4146. A bill to require the Federal Election Commission to conduct a study on the classification of political campaign emails as spam; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 4147. A bill to establish the Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program at the Department of Energy to provide financial assistance to promote energy efficiency and onsite renewable technologies in manufacturing facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 4148. A bill to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 4149. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove the limitation on re-

imbursement for emergency treatment of amounts owed to a third party for which the veteran is responsible under a health-plan contract; to the Committee on Veterans' 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. ROUNDS:

S. Res. 640. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate on United States-Israel cooperation on precision-guided munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 641. A resolution designating April 13, 2020, as "National Borinqueneers Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Res. 642. A resolution honoring the life, legacy, and achievements of Annie Glenn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 643. A resolution recognizing the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States and the need for greater access to music education for African-American students and designating June 2020 as African-American Music Appreciation Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. Res. 644. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Postal Service should remain a strong and universal service for the people of the United States, and should receive an appropriation to offset revenues lost due to the COVID-19 emergency; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 511

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 511, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 1841

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1841, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects

and transportation fuels, and for other purposes.

S. 2336

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2336, a bill to improve the management of information technology projects and investments of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2633

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2633, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for wigs as durable medical equipment under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 3170

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3170, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand access to breastfeeding accommodations in the workplace, and for other purposes.

S. 3318

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3318, a bill to promote transparency in health care pricing.

S. 3353

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3353, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients, and for other purposes.

S. 3444

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3444, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 3599

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3599, a bill to enhance our Nation's nurse and physician workforce during the COVID-19 crisis

by recapturing unused immigrant visas.

S. 3703

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 3703, a bill to amend the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act to improve the prevention of elder abuse and exploitation of individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 3812

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3812, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include veterans of World War II.

S. 3814

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3814, a bill to establish a loan program for businesses affected by COVID-19 and to extend the loan forgiveness period for paycheck protection program loans made to the hardest hit businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 3910

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3910, a bill to establish a presumption that certain firefighters who are Federal employees and have COVID-19 contracted that disease while in the performance of their official duties, and for other purposes.

S. 3964

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3964, a bill to amend the national service laws to prioritize national service programs and projects that are directly related to the response to and recovery from the COVID-19 public health emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 3979

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to temporarily waive cost-sharing amounts under the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program during certain declared emergencies.

S. 4001

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator

from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 4001, a bill to amend title IX of the Social Security Act to improve emergency unemployment relief for governmental entities and nonprofit organizations.

S. 4014

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4014, a bill to provide for supplemental loans under the Paycheck Protection Program.

S. 4017

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4017, a bill to extend the period for obligations or expenditures for amounts obligated for the National Disaster Resilience competition.

S. 4019

At the request of Mr. WARNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 4019, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

S. 4048

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 4048, a bill to modify the deadlines for completing the 2020 decennial census of population and related tabulations, and for other purposes.

S. 4088

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4088, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services.

S. 4117

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4117, a bill to provide automatic forgiveness for paycheck protection program loans under \$150,000, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 274

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 274, a resolution expressing solidarity with Falun Gong practitioners who have lost lives, freedoms, and other rights for adhering to their beliefs and practices, and condemning the practice of non-consenting organ harvesting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1681

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1681 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1701

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1701 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1706

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1706 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1707

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1707 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1754

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1754 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1756

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added

as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1756 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1763

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1763 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1784

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1784 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1792

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1792 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1793

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1793 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1804

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1804 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1881

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1881 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1884

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1884 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1889

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1895

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1895 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1932

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1932 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1972

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1972 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

struction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2059

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2059 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2068

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2068 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2069

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2069 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2101

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2101 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2116

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2116 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2136

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added

as cosponsors of amendment No. 2136 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2168

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2168 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2198

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2198 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2198 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 2206

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2206 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2219

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2219 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2244

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2244 in-

tended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2245

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2245 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2251

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2251 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2252

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2252 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2270

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2270 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2301

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2301 proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2315

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2315 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2317

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2317 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2318

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2318 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2330

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2330 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2334

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2334 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2336

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2336 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year

2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2352

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2352 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2361

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2361 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2364

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2364 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2370

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2370 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2374

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2374 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2383

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2383 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 4132. A bill to establish the Commission on the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Coronavirus Commission Act. Representative ADAM SCHIFF has introduced companion legislation in the House.

This bill would establish a commission on the coronavirus pandemic to better understand the vulnerabilities it has revealed in our national security and healthcare system and improve our preparedness for future crises.

It is crucial to improve our understanding of pandemic threats and health issues that the United States could face in the coming decades to better protect our population and mitigate the risk of a similar human and economic catastrophe.

Nearly 130,000 Americans have died from COVID-19. Hospitals have struggled to secure enough personal protective equipment to keep health workers safe, testing levels remain inadequate, and a breakthrough therapeutic, let alone a vaccine, has yet to be developed.

More than 41 million Americans have been laid off, and the unemployment rate is likely well over 20 percent. Large numbers of businesses have permanently closed due to the coronavirus pandemic.

The commission that would be created by our bill would conduct a comprehensive review of the government's coronavirus response and make recommendations on how we can be better prepared in the future. The commission would complement other oversight efforts in Congress and elsewhere.

The coronavirus commission would examine U.S. Government preparedness in advance of this pandemic, the Federal Government's response to it, and provide recommendations to improve our ability to respond to and recover from future outbreaks, epidemics, and pandemics.

This legislation is modeled after and closely mirrors legislation enacted in 2002 that created the 9/11 Commission.

The Coronavirus Commission would be composed of 10 members, with the same partisan balance as the 9/11 commissioners and prohibited from being current Federal officials, with a variety of backgrounds in relevant fields, including public health, epidemiology, emergency preparedness, armed services, and intelligence; provide a full accounting to the President, Congress, and the American people of the facts and circumstances related to the outbreak in the United States, including our preparedness, the intelligence and information we had available before the virus reached the United States, and how Federal, State, and local governments, as well as the private sector, responded to the crisis; hold hearings and public events to obtain information and to educate the public; possess subpoena power to compel cooperation by relevant witnesses and materials from the Federal Government, as well as State and local governments; make specific recommendations to Congress and the executive branch to improve our preparedness for pandemic disease; have adequate staffing and resources to be able to complete expeditiously the monumental task at hand so we can be prepared for the next epidemic or pandemic to hit the nation; and the commission would be established after February 2021, hopefully when the pandemic has been overcome and after the presidential election.

The coronavirus showed just how unprepared and slow we were to respond to a major outbreak, and that lack of readiness has endangered lives.

We were unable to ramp up testing, we had insufficient safety equipment for doctors and nurses, and we lacked any kind of consistent Federal guidelines for States and cities.

We know this will not be the last outbreak, so a 9/11 Commission-style panel is necessary to fix these mistakes going forward and apply the lessons from this pandemic to future crises.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill.

Thank you.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 4139. A bill to encourage support by international financial institutions for a robust global response to the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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. 4139

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 “Support for Global Financial Institution Pandemic Response Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR A ROBUST GLOBAL RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICIES AT THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(2))) to use the voice and vote of the United States at that institution—

(A) to seek to ensure adequate fiscal space for world economies in response to the global coronavirus disease 2019 (commonly referred to as “COVID-19”) pandemic through—

(i) the suspension of all debt service payments to the institution; and

(ii) the relaxation of fiscal targets for any government operating a program supported by the institution, or seeking financing from the institution, in response to the pandemic;

(B) to oppose the approval or endorsement of any loan, grant, document, or strategy that would lead to a decrease in health care spending or in any other spending that would impede the ability of any country to prevent or contain the spread of, or treat persons who are or may be infected with, the SARS-CoV-2 virus; and

(C) to require approval of all Special Drawing Rights allocation transfers from wealthier member countries to countries that are emerging markets or developing countries, based on confirmation of implementable transparency mechanisms or protocols to ensure the allocations are used for the public good and in response to the global pandemic.

(2) IMF ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL DRAWING RIGHTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to support the issuance of a special allocation of not less than 2,000,000,000,000 Special Drawing Rights so that governments are able to access additional resources to finance their responses to the global COVID-19 pandemic.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies

shall include in the annual report required by section 1701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r) a description of progress made toward advancing the policies described in subsection (a).

(c) TERMINATION.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall have no force or effect after the earlier of—

(1) the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Treasury submits to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report stating that the SARS-CoV-2 virus is no longer a serious threat to public health in any part of the world.

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

S. 4143. A bill to extend the unemployment insurance provisions of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act for the duration of the economic recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on the main topic this morning, I am proud to support Senator WYDEN and Senator BENNET. As the number of COVID-19 cases accelerates across much of the country, the economic toll of this pandemic continues to fall hard on American families and American workers. Over 33 million Americans—at least one-fifth of the entire workforce—have now applied for unemployment assistance since the pandemic began.

Democrats secured a crucial enhancement of that unemployment assistance in the CARES Act—an extra \$600 a week, which, according to a study by Columbia University, prevented as many as 12 million Americans from slipping into poverty. By the end of this month, those emergency unemployment benefits will expire, but unfortunately the high levels of unemployment will not. Without an extension of enhanced benefits, Americans struggling without work will have their legs cut out from under them at the worst possible time, in the middle of a raging pandemic.

I am joining with my colleague, Ranking Member WYDEN of the Senate Finance Committee, to introduce a bill that will serve as both a short-term solution and a bold long-term strategy to keep American workers and the American economy afloat. I thank Senator WYDEN for his help and Senator BENNET for his help. Together, we put together a very strong piece of legislation.

Our bill, the Schumer-Wyden American Workforce Rescue Act, would do something very simple: It would tie the extension of enhanced unemployment benefits to economic data, not arbitrary political deadlines. As long as unemployment remains very high—over 11 percent—the enhanced benefits will stay in place. When unemployment goes down, the benefits will phase out appropriately.

This automatic stabilization for unemployment benefits would be one of

the first programs of its kind, but at its core, this policy is basic common sense. When Americans truly need the benefits, the benefits will be there. When the economy gets better, those enhanced benefits will be reduced. The impetus for this legislation is common sense. We should not allow the economic security of the American people to depend on the political whims of the legislatures—Federal or State.

When we passed the CARES Act over 2 months ago, Democrats knew the extra \$600 in weekly unemployment assistance was only a temporary salve for struggling Americans. We had hoped the economy would be able to bounce back and unemployment would quickly go down. Clearly, that is not the case today.

Experts are warning us that the economic drag from this crisis will take years, if not a full decade, to fully abate. Further action is very much needed and very, very necessary. But for months, Republicans have doubled and tripled down on their strategy of delaying action on COVID-19 relief legislation. They have kept the American people needlessly wondering if the help they rely on will remain in place much longer.

We need to take the next step and tie unemployment benefits to economic triggers that will ensure that so long as Americans are hurting, a safety net will remain in place—whether it is COVID-19 or any other economic disaster in the future that causes unemployment to rise. That is how you give the American people the kind of peace of mind they need that they will not needlessly fall into poverty this year or next year or the year after.

No doubt, this is a new idea. It would be one of the first programs of its kind. But we need to take this bold step forward to guarantee that the Federal Government effectively serves the American people in times of crisis.

There is a long road ahead before the U.S. economy gets back on its feet. In many parts of the country, States are reimposing restrictions on businesses, restaurants, and other places of employment to halt a renewed spread of the disease. Americans will continue to wonder, when can I get back to work?

I am proud to join my colleagues and champion this legislation to provide unemployment benefits for as long as Americans need them—provide unemployment benefits for as long as Americans need them.

Before I yield, I want to thank my colleague Senator WYDEN for championing this legislation as well. He has been a leading and fierce advocate for this policy in our caucus, and I am both grateful and proud to stand with him this morning. I also thank Senator BENNET, who is always thoughtful and thinking on to the future—one of the first Members to alert this Chamber and the country of the disparities in income and wealth distribution—and has had vital input as well. We thank him.

This policy is smart, it is timely, and it is forward-thinking. So it is no surprise that my colleagues, Senator WYDEN—one of the authors—and Senator BENNET have had great input.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator WYDEN and then Senator BENNET be allowed to speak immediately after me for as much time as they may consume.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to be with Senator SCHUMER to advance the Schumer-Wyden legislative proposal today, and I am very pleased that we are joined by Senator BENNET, a particularly valuable member of the Senate Finance Committee, who has worked on these issues for many, many years.

As Senator SCHUMER outlined, we are talking about a fresh approach as we look to extending supercharged unemployment benefits for as long as our economy suffers under the COVID-19 pandemic. As the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee that produced the \$600 extra benefit each week until July 31 and the breakthrough to cover for the first time gig workers and the self-employed and part-timers and others, I am going to take a few minutes to explain why this next step to create a dependable safety net in America is a no-brainer.

We know that tens of millions of Americans are out of work due to COVID-19. The pandemic is, in fact, getting worse. Dr. Tony Fauci yesterday talked about the prospect of having 100,000 new confirmed cases per day nationwide. We don't even want to imagine what the unemployment situation is going to look like with 100,000 new coronavirus cases every day. You cannot have a healthy economy in a country suffering from mass death.

I know the President got up in the Rose Garden and celebrated the last jobs report like it was the greatest news since the end of World War II, but you have to be living in a country club fantasy land to believe this economic crisis is anywhere close to ending.

Tens of millions of Americans today are out of work in States with COVID hotspots. There are reports that people who went back to work in the spring are getting laid off for a second time. The numbers show that it disproportionately harms Black and Hispanic people suffering in this crisis, and the layoffs are hitting those Americans especially hard in industries that pay modest wages. This is a recipe for injustice and for long-term economic hardship. Our proposal is desperately needed because the country is not on a straight line to recovery.

Democrats demanded the supercharged unemployment benefits because workers are not to blame for the crisis. Doctors don't yet have a cure for COVID-19, but the Congress does have a way to address the financial strain of joblessness. That is why Democrats demanded full wage replacement during

the negotiations on unemployment benefits in the CARES Act.

Secretary Scalia told those of us negotiating this issue that State UI systems—unemployment systems—were too outdated to make it work anytime soon. These are Federal benefits, but under employment law, the States administer the program and get the benefits out.

We knew that there would be some challenges, and we proposed a simple solution: \$600 extra per week across the board, adding up to full wage replacement for the typical worker. It was clear that was the only possibility of getting the supercharged benefits out to millions of workers quickly.

It hadn't been easy. In a number of States, the unemployment systems run on Bronze Age technology. In some other cases—and Leader SCHUMER and I are inquiring into these right now—it is a case of Republican sabotage. That is why, for the long term, it is certainly worth looking at a Federal approach for administering unemployment benefits as a better strategy.

But in today's economic conditions, dealing with the suffering we are seeing right now—the suffering that Tony Fauci talked about yesterday that could hammer this country from sea to shining sea—if you are dealing with today's conditions and you want to get full-wage benefits out on time, there is no alternative to \$600 per week across the board. Furthermore, there is no good argument for cutting or eliminating benefits as long as the pandemic is raging and getting worse.

On the one hand, we heard Secretary Scalia and other Republicans repeat the old line. They have been talking against unemployment for ages, and they always say the problem is lazy workers dependent on government are going to drag the economy down by collecting unemployment instead of going back to their jobs.

On the other hand, Republicans have repeatedly said the economy is roaring back to full employment so there is no need for extending benefits any longer. You can't have it both ways. You can't have it both ways, that these workers are dragging the economy down and then talk about how everything is booming.

Regardless of how these arguments conflict, neither one holds any water to begin with. I believe it is an insult to American workers to say they would rather sit at home than work hard and earn their pay. Our workers have a strong working ethic, and how could anybody believe in the greatness of America, as the President is always talking about, and think so little of its workers?

Second, it is time to quit pretending to know whether the crisis is anywhere near over. The number of people filing new unemployment claims every week, even now, is two and three times higher than the worst single week of the Great Recession.

Senators have a right to stake out whatever ground they want on this

issue. I will tell you, the American people overwhelmingly support extending supercharged unemployment benefits. You see it in polls—polls done by centrist organizations. But more importantly, you hear about it when you are home.

Americans don't buy Secretary Scalia's line about lazy workers or dependence on the government. I can tell you, based on the conversations I had with Oregonians, they don't want any handouts. They understand the country is facing a severe historic crisis of joblessness, and they want the Congress to act. You cannot have a healthy economy in a country suffering from mass debt, particularly in the middle of a pandemic.

It would be an act of sabotage and, I think, unthinkable cruelty to slash these benefits and send all these jobless families into destitution. That is why Senator SCHUMER and I have outlined this proposal to extend these supercharged unemployment benefits in a manner that is tethered to economic conditions on the ground.

We always hear our colleagues talk about policies and the need for policies that really mirror what is going on in the real-world economy, in the private sector. That is what this proposal does. This proposal says we are going to tie the economic benefits; we are going to tether them to economic conditions on the ground.

I saw our colleague from South Dakota, a Member of the Republican leadership, Senator THUNE, say that maybe the benefits ought to taper down when unemployment goes down. I looked at that, and I said that Democrats share that view. That is what our trigger proposal is all about. You have to have them in a way that is going to make sure people can pay rent and groceries, which is what the \$600 benefit made possible and will in the future.

But when unemployment tapers down, then, under our proposal, we make an accommodation for that. What we are going to do is common sense. It provides certainty and predictability for American workers, but it will also send a message across the country that there is a policy that will make a more dependable safety net. Yet it will also do what the head of the Federal Reserve just said, which is to make sure that family budgets, which are the ones that drive the American economy, are ones where people can pay the rent and buy groceries.

The bottom line is we have a moral obligation to not turn our back on those who are suffering. I am telling you, the Senate is going to go home here in a day or so for several weeks, and Senators are going to hear loud and clear that workers are concerned about whether, after July 31, they are going to be able to pay the rent and be able to buy groceries. I think they are worried, and I hear it from all parts of my community—about a tsunami of evictions and people simply not being able to feed their families. I think

those who disagree with the Schumer-Wyden proposal ought to come out here and say what they going to offer those people who are hurting.

Influential objective thinkers about the economy, like Jerome Powell, are saying that these kinds of benefits are absolutely key to making sure that the family budget, which drives the American economy, is going to be positioned to pay the rent and buy groceries.

I gather from Leader SCHUMER's remarks that I can yield to our Senator from Colorado, a particularly valuable member of the Finance Committee, who has been working on safety net issues for many, many years.

Mr. BENNET. I would like to thank Leader SCHUMER and the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN, for bringing this commonsense proposal to the floor.

I have long advocated for the idea that we should tie benefits to the conditions of the economy rather than simply politically convenient dates or inconvenient dates that don't matter, don't make any sense to working people in our country, and create idiotic fights here that don't help the people we all have been sent here, in theory at least, to serve.

Right now, we are facing an unprecedented set of conditions in our country. We are being racked by an economic downturn. It is different from any that we have ever seen before and at the same time, we are facing this incredible health crisis. One in six workers in this country is unemployed. One in six workers is unemployed today.

But for once, thankfully, we were able to come together in a bipartisan way in March and pass the CARES Act, which is benefitting these workers in two ways.

First, we expanded unemployment benefits to cover almost 10 million self-employed workers, gig workers, and others who are usually left behind in circumstances like this. That is something we should have changed a long time ago, but we finally got it done, and we did it in a bipartisan way.

Second, as Leader SCHUMER and Senator WYDEN said, we added \$600 per week to normal unemployment benefits for all 30 million workers claiming benefits. That \$600 weekly benefit has prevented a level of severe hardship that is almost impossible to describe. It has paid rent and prevented evictions. It has kept food on the table so families don't go hungry. It has kept the lights on and paid for the internet so our kids can learn. The bottom line is that the \$600 weekly payment has been an essential lifeline to families in the middle of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

In Colorado alone, over 450,000 workers are receiving the expanded benefit, and it has put a total of nearly \$2.5 billion into our economy. Nationwide, the numbers are staggering. One analysis showed that these additional payments help keep 12 million Americans out of poverty and keep poverty rates from

rising. Without these payments, wages across the entire economy would have declined by 10 percent from February to May. We completely offset that decline.

You know what that means is that working people actually were able to continue to buy things in this economy. The leader might be interested to know that I was talking to an economist recently, Raj Chetty, from Harvard, who has done a study, including other places, of New York. That study shows that the biggest loss in terms of consumer spending has come from the wealthiest areas in New York. That resulted in the biggest unemployment.

In other words, if you have a small business in a wealthy area in New York, your small business is cratering because wealthy people aren't spending money on services because they are scared of getting COVID.

In other parts of New York, there has been much less destabilization, and that is because of these unemployment benefits—directly because of these unemployment benefits—because where the unemployment rate has gone up, people's incomes have been able to be stable.

I am the first to say that not everything we have done with the CARES Act has been perfect. As we know, the CARES Act left out too many families, and too many States have been too slow to get these benefits out. That is the result of delivering benefits through 50 different systems that have been underfunded and undermined for 50 years. But once they have gotten out, these benefits have made a transformational difference. Everyone in the Senate should be proud of that.

I come out here all the time and complain how terrible this place is. I was amazed to hear the majority leader this morning talk about the "incompetence" of local officials. There is no body in the world more incompetent than this Senate. But here is a moment when we can actually be proud of something that we did here. Even President Trump has been running campaign ads touting these benefits. Even as he is running these ads—which, as Senator WYDEN said, he is running because this unemployment benefit is popular—he is threatening the take away the benefit by allowing the \$600 to sunset at the end of July. That would be a profound mistake.

Right now, even with these enhanced benefits in place, 17 percent of American families can't cover 3 months of basic expenses. Without the extra benefits, that number wouldn't be 17 percent. It would be 43 percent, almost half of the families in our country. Today, nearly 10 percent of Americans can't make the rent. Without the extra benefits, that number would double or triple.

If we let these benefits expire, we are going to throw tens of millions of Americans who rely on them into a profound financial crisis. We will be cutting their monthly income by \$2,400.

If we go over that cliff and completely cut off benefits, not only will it cut incomes by 50 percent or 60 percent or 70 percent for literally millions of Americans who can't go back to work, but it will cause extreme damage to the economy.

Nothing has kept our economy afloat more than this investment in unemployment. Allowing these benefits to expire would remove \$50 billion a month from the economy, reducing the GDP by 2.5 percent in the second half of this year. That would lead to 2 million jobs lost and a significant increase in the unemployment rate. So we would be right back here again. We shouldn't be doing that, at this point, with this very fragile economy and when COVID-19 is spreading in far too many places.

Some of the industries are facing extreme crises in my State as well as across the country. Hotels are projected to suffer revenue losses of almost 60 percent in 2020. Between March and May 2020, total restaurant sales were down more than \$94 billion from expected levels, and 90 percent of independent concert venues are at risk of permanently closing down in a few months without receiving additional relief. We can't tell people who are working in all of these industries—when there is no way these businesses will even be close to being 100 percent in the near future—that they are just on their own.

That is why we need to pass an expanded unemployment benefit that continues after July. We should tie that expanded benefit to the unemployment rate, as Senator SCHUMER and Senator WYDEN have designed, so that it steps the benefit down as the economy heals. That makes sense. Nobody here wants to be in a place at which the unemployment benefit disincentivizes people from working, which is why they step it down, but it needs to stay in place until this economy heals.

It is the wrong approach for the country and for the working people in this country to send them over the cliff right now, and it will be the wrong approach to send them over the cliff in 6 months or even in 2 years if the unemployment rate is still elevated. We need to extend expanded unemployment benefits, and we need to do it until the economy recovers. It is the right thing for the workers and families who are wondering how they are going to get through one of the most difficult challenges of their lives. It is the right thing to do for the broader economy in order for it to come back as strongly as it can as we work toward a vaccine.

I thank my colleagues again for their tremendous leadership. I hope that we will be able to work on this in a bipartisan way, as we did before, and that we will be able to pass these extensions for the American people.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 4143

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “American Workforce Rescue Act of 2020”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Extension of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.
- Sec. 3. Extension and expansion of the pandemic emergency unemployment compensation program.
- Sec. 4. Extension of pandemic unemployment assistance.
- Sec. 5. Extension of additional unemployment compensation provisions.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 2104(e) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) **APPLICABILITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An agreement entered into under this section shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

“(A) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

“(B) ending on or before the applicable end date described in paragraph (2).

“(2) **APPLICABLE END DATE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The applicable end date described in this paragraph with respect to a State is the date that is 13 weeks after the first date (after the date the State entered into an agreement under this section) that the State is not in an extended benefit period described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) **EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given day, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(ii) such section 203(f)—

“(I) were applied by substituting ‘6.0’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.”.

(b) **REVISION OF AMOUNT.**—Section 2104(b) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “(or, for weeks of unemployment beginning after July 31, 2020, and ending on or before the applicable end date described in subsection (e)(2) the amount described in paragraph (3))” after “\$600”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **AMOUNT OF FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.**—

“(A) **TIER.**—The amount described in this paragraph is, with respect to a State, the following amount:

“(i) **FIRST TIER AMOUNT.**—In the case of weeks beginning in a first tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(i), \$100.

“(ii) **SECOND TIER AMOUNT.**—In the case of weeks beginning in a second tier high unem-

ployment period described in subparagraph (B)(ii), \$200.

“(iii) **THIRD TIER AMOUNT.**—In the case of weeks beginning in a third tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(iii), \$300.

“(iv) **FOURTH TIER AMOUNT.**—In the case of weeks beginning in a fourth tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(iv), \$400.

“(v) **FIFTH TIER AMOUNT.**—In the case of weeks beginning in a third tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(v), \$500.

“(vi) **SIXTH TIER AMOUNT.**—In the case of weeks beginning in a fourth tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(vi), \$600.

“(B) **HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT PERIODS.**—

“(i) **FIRST TIER.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), a first tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(II) such section 203(f)—

“(aa) were applied by substituting ‘6.0 percent but less than 7.0 percent’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(ii) **SECOND TIER.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), a second tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(II) such section 203(f)—

“(aa) were applied by substituting ‘7.0 percent but less than 8.0 percent’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(iii) **THIRD TIER.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), a third tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(II) such section 203(f)—

“(aa) were applied by substituting ‘8.0 percent but less than 9.0 percent’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(iv) **FOURTH TIER.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iv), a fourth tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(II) such section 203(f)—

“(aa) were applied by substituting ‘9.0 percent but less than 10.0 percent’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(v) **FIFTH TIER.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(v), a fifth tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(II) such section 203(f)—

“(aa) were applied by substituting ‘10.0 percent but less than 11.0 percent’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(vi) **SIXTH TIER.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(vi), a sixth tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(II) such section 203(f)—

“(aa) were applied by substituting ‘11.0 percent’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(C) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

“(i) **MINIMUM PERIOD ON A TIER BEFORE MOVING TO A LOWER TIER.**—Once a State is in a high unemployment period tier described in clause (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), or (vi) of subparagraph (B), the State may not move to a lower high unemployment period tier (resulting in a lower dollar amount under subparagraph (A)) before the State has been in the existing high unemployment period tier for a period of at least 13 consecutive weeks.

“(ii) **DEEMED FIRST TIER.**—For purposes of determining the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation during the 13-week period described in subsection (e)(2)(A) with respect to a State, the State shall be deemed to be in a first tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(i) during such period.”.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 2107(g) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended to read as follows:

“(g) **APPLICABILITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), an agreement entered into under this section shall apply, with respect to a State, to weeks of unemployment—

“(A) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

“(B) ending on or before the applicable end date described in paragraph (2).

“(2) **APPLICABLE END DATE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The applicable end date described in this paragraph with respect to a State is the later of—

“(i) March 27, 2021; or

“(ii) if, as of the date under clause (i), the State is in an extended benefit period described in subparagraph (B), the first date after the date under clause (i) that the State is not in an extended benefit period described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given day, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(ii) such section 203(f)—

“(I) were applied by substituting ‘5.5’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(3) TRANSITION FOR AMOUNT REMAINING IN ACCOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in the case of an individual who has amounts remaining in an account established under subsection (b) as of the last day of the last week (as determined in accordance with the applicable State law) ending on or before the date described in paragraph (1)(B), pandemic emergency unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual from such amounts for any week beginning after such date for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this section.

“(B) LIMITATION.—No compensation shall be payable by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after the date that is 4 months after the date described in paragraph (1)(B).”.

(b) EXPANSION.—Section 2107(b) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(3) FIRST-TIER PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—The amount established in an account under paragraph (1) shall be equal to 13 times the individual’s average weekly benefit amount, which includes the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation under section 2104, for the benefit year.

“(4) SECOND-TIER PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If, at the time that the amount added to an individual’s account under paragraph (3) (in this section referred to as ‘first-tier pandemic emergency unemployment compensation’) is exhausted, or at any time thereafter, such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under subparagraph (B)), such account shall be augmented by an amount (in this section referred to as ‘second-tier pandemic emergency unemployment compensation’) equal to 13 times the individual’s average weekly benefit amount, which includes the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation under section 2104, for the benefit year.

“(B) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given time, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(ii) such section 203(f) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(C) LIMITATION.—The account of an individual may be augmented not more than once under this subsection.

“(5) THIRD-TIER PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If, at the time that the amount added to an individual’s account under paragraph (4) is exhausted, or at any time thereafter, such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under subparagraph (B)), such account shall be augmented by an amount (in this section referred to as ‘third-tier pandemic emergency unemployment compensation’) equal to 13 times the individual’s average weekly benefit amount, which includes the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation under section 2104, for the benefit year.

“(B) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given time, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(ii) such section 203(f)—

“(I) were applied by substituting ‘7.5’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(C) LIMITATION.—The account of an individual may be augmented not more than once under this subsection.

“(6) FOURTH-TIER PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If, at the time that the amount added to an individual’s account under paragraph (5) is exhausted, or at any time thereafter, such individual’s State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under subparagraph (B)), such account shall be augmented by an amount (in this section referred to as ‘fourth-tier pandemic emergency unemployment compensation’) equal to 13 times the individual’s average weekly benefit amount, which includes the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation under section 2104, for the benefit year.

“(B) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given time, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

“(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

“(ii) such section 203(f)—

“(I) were applied by substituting ‘8.5’ for ‘6.5’ in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

“(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

“(C) LIMITATION.—The account of an individual may be augmented not more than once under this subsection.

“(7) COORDINATION OF PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION WITH REGULAR COMPENSATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If—

“(i) an individual has been determined to be entitled to pandemic emergency unemployment compensation with respect to a benefit year;

“(ii) that benefit year has expired;

“(iii) that individual has remaining entitlement to pandemic emergency unemployment compensation with respect to that benefit year; and

“(iv) that individual would qualify for a new benefit year in which the weekly benefit amount of regular compensation is at least either \$100 or 25 percent less than the individual’s weekly benefit amount in the benefit year referred to in clause (i), then the State shall determine eligibility for compensation as provided in subparagraph (B).

“(B) DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—For individuals described in subparagraph (A), the State shall determine whether the individual is to be paid pandemic emergency unemployment compensation or regular compensation for a week of unemployment using one of the following methods:

“(i) The State shall, if permitted by State law, establish a new benefit year, but defer the payment of regular compensation with respect to that new benefit year until exhaustion of all pandemic emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in subparagraph (A)(i).

“(ii) The State shall, if permitted by State law, defer the establishment of a new benefit year (which uses all the wages and employment which would have been used to establish a benefit year but for the application of this subparagraph), until exhaustion of all pandemic emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in subparagraph (A)(i).

“(iii) The State shall pay, if permitted by State law—

“(I) regular compensation equal to the weekly benefit amount established under the new benefit year; and

“(II) pandemic emergency unemployment compensation equal to the difference between that weekly benefit amount and the weekly benefit amount for the expired benefit year.

“(iv) The State shall determine rights to pandemic emergency unemployment compensation without regard to any rights to regular compensation if the individual elects to not file a claim for regular compensation under the new benefit year.”.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

Section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)(ii), by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)”; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) LIMITATION ON DURATION OF ASSISTANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The total number of weeks for which a covered individual may receive assistance under this section shall not exceed 39 weeks and such total shall include any week for which the covered individual received regular compensation or extended benefits under any Federal or State law, or pandemic emergency unemployment compensation under section 2107, except that if after March 27, 2020, the duration of extended benefits, or pandemic emergency unemployment compensation under section 2107 is extended, the 39-week period described in this paragraph shall be extended by—

“(i) the number of weeks that is equal to the number of weeks by which the extended benefits were extended; and

“(ii) in the case of an extension of pandemic emergency unemployment compensation under section 2107, by the number of weeks that is equal to the additional number of weeks (through augmentation) available

with respect to the State in which the individual resides under paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of section 2107(b).

“(B) EXTENSION OF ASSISTANCE.—For the purpose of an extension of the 39-week period under subparagraph (A), the following rules shall apply:

“(i) TRANSITION PERIOD.—Section 2107(g)(3) shall apply to any extension of assistance under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) ACCOUNTS AND GRANDFATHERING.—In determining the number of weeks available for a covered individual under an extension described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the Secretary shall apply rules that are similar to the rules described in paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of section 2107(b), including with respect to accounts and grandfathering.”;

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “section 625” each place it appears and inserting “part 625”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) UNEMPLOYMENT RATE CALCULATION FOR CERTAIN TERRITORIES.—In the case of Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau, the following rules shall apply:

“(1) For the purposes of subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii) of this section, the Secretary shall determine the total unemployment rate of the territory in a manner similar to the manner under section 2107(g)(2).

“(2) For the purpose of subsection (c)(2)(B) of this section, the Secretary shall determine the total unemployment rate of the territory in a manner similar to the manner under paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of section 2107(b).

“(3) For the purpose of subsection (d)(2) of this section, the Secretary shall determine the total unemployment rate of the territory in a manner similar to the manner under section 2104(b)(3)(B).”.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF ADDITIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROVISIONS.

(a) EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF FOR GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 903(i)(1)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1103(i)(1)(D)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act)”.

(b) TEMPORARY FULL FEDERAL FUNDING OF THE FIRST WEEK OF COMPENSABLE REGULAR UNEMPLOYMENT FOR STATES WITH NO WAITING WEEK.—Section 2105(e)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)”.

(c) TEMPORARY FINANCING OF SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION PAYMENTS IN STATES WITH PROGRAMS IN LAW.—Section 2108(b)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)”.

(d) TEMPORARY FINANCING OF SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION AGREEMENTS.—Section 2109(d)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)”.

(e) WAIVER OF THE 7-DAY WAITING PERIOD FOR BENEFITS UNDER THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT.—Section 2112(a) of

the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)”.

(f) TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR STATES WITH ADVANCES.—Section 1202(b)(10)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1322(b)(10)(A)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act)”.

(g) FULL FEDERAL FUNDING OF EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR A LIMITED PERIOD.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4105 of the Emergency Unemployment Insurance Stabilization and Access Act of 2020 (contained in division D of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (Public Law 116-127)) are each amended by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act)”.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself,
Mr. PETERS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr.
LANKFORD, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr.
CARPER):

S. 4148. A bill to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 4148

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-254; 6 U.S.C. 621 note) is amended by striking “July 23, 2020” and inserting “July 27, 2023”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

SENATE RESOLUTION 640—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION ON PRECISION-GUIDED MUNITIONS

Mr. ROUNDS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 640

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Department of Defense has cooperated extensively with Israel to assist in the procurement of precision-guided munitions, and such cooperation represents an important example of robust United States support for Israel;

(2) to the extent practicable, the Secretary of Defense should take further measures to expedite deliveries of precision-guided munitions to Israel; and

(3) regularized annual purchases of precision-guided munitions by Israel, in accordance with existing requirements and practices regarding the export of defense articles and defense services, coordinated with the

United States Air Force annual purchase of precision-guided munitions, would enhance the security of both the United States and Israel by—

(A) promoting a more efficient use of defense resources by taking advantage of economies of scale;

(B) enabling the United States and Israel to address crisis requirements for precision-guided munitions in a timely and flexible manner; and

(C) encouraging the defense industrial base to maintain routine production lines of precision-guided munitions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 641—DESIGNATING APRIL 13, 2020, AS “NATIONAL BORINQUENEERS DAY”

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES 641

Whereas, in 1898, Puerto Rico became a territory of the United States and, the following year, Congress authorized raising a military unit of volunteer soldiers on the island, which was organized as the “Puerto Rico Regiment of Volunteer Infantry”;

Whereas, in 1908, Congress incorporated the regiment as part of the regular United States Army as the “Puerto Rico Regiment of Infantry”;

Whereas, in 1917, after the United States’ entry into World War I, the Puerto Rico Regiment of Infantry was sent to Panama to defend the Panama Canal Zone;

Whereas, in 1920, Congress redesignated the unit as the 65th Infantry Regiment of the United States Army;

Whereas during World War II, the 65th Infantry Regiment served in North Africa and Europe, including combat operations in France and Germany for which members of the unit received commendations for valiant service, including 1 Distinguished Service Cross, 2 Silver Stars, 2 Bronze Stars, and 90 Purple Hearts;

Whereas, in 1950, the 65th Infantry Regiment deployed to South Korea, and during the voyage the soldiers nicknamed the unit the “Borinqueneers”, a reference to the native Taino Tribe’s name for the island of Puerto Rico;

Whereas during the Korean War, the 65th Infantry Regiment (hereinafter, the “Borinqueneers”) engaged in substantial combat operations on the Korean Peninsula, and the unit played a central role in several important offensives and counter-offensives that earned it well-deserved admiration and commendation;

Whereas the Borinqueneers’ extraordinary service during the Korean War resulted in the Regiment receiving 2 Presidential Unit Citations (Army and Navy), 2 Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Citations, a Meritorious Unit Commendation (Army), a Navy Unit Commendation, the Chryssoun Aristion Andrias (Bravery Gold Medal of Greece), and campaign participation credits for United Nations Offensive, Chinese Communist Forces (CCF) Intervention, First United Nations Counteroffensive, CCF Spring Offensive, United Nations Summer-Fall Offensive, Second Korean Winter, Korea Summer-Fall 1952, Third Korean Winter, and Korea Summer 1953;

Whereas the Borinqueneers’ extraordinary service during the Korean War also resulted in numerous individual commendations and awards for its soldiers, including 1 Medal of Honor, 9 Distinguished Service Crosses, more than 250 Silver Stars, more than 600 Bronze Stars, and more than 2,700 Purple Hearts;

Whereas, in 1956, the 65th Infantry Regiment was deactivated from the regular United States Army and, in 1959, its units and regimental number were assigned to the Puerto Rico National Guard;

Whereas, in 1982, the United States Army Center of Military History officially authorized designating the 65th Infantry Regiment as the “Borinqueneers”; and

Whereas, on April 13, 2016, Congress awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment in recognition of the Borinqueneers’ numerous contributions to American history and outstanding military service from World War I through the recent conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 13, 2020, as “National Borinqueneers Day”;

(2) recognizes the bravery, service, and sacrifice of the Puerto Rican soldiers of the 65th Infantry Regiment in the armed conflicts of the United States in the 20th and 21st centuries;

(3) expresses deep gratitude for the contributions to the Armed Forces that have been made by hundreds of thousands of patriotic United States citizens from Puerto Rico; and

(4) urges individuals and communities across the United States to participate in activities that are designed—

(A) to celebrate the distinguished service of the military veterans who served in the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the “Borinqueneers”;

(B) to pay tribute to the sacrifices made and adversities overcome by Puerto Rican and Hispanic military service members; and

(C) to recognize the significant contributions to American history made by the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the “Borinqueneers”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 642—HONORING THE LIFE, LEGACY, AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF ANNIE GLENN

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 642

Whereas Anna “Annie” Margaret Castor was born on February 17, 1920, in Columbus, Ohio, and grew up attending public schools in New Concord, Ohio, with her late husband, Senator John Glenn;

Whereas Annie and John met at ages 2 and 3, respectively, grew up as friends and playmates, and never knew life without the other;

Whereas Annie grew up as a competitive swimmer and a lifeguard in her community;

Whereas Annie was a skilled musician and, in 1942, received and turned down an offer from The Julliard School so she could marry John Glenn;

Whereas Annie earned a Bachelor’s degree in music with a minor in secretarial science from Muskingum College in 1942;

Whereas Annie and John married on April 6, 1943, in their hometown of New Concord, Ohio;

Whereas, whenever the family moved, Annie Glenn would serve as a church organist in her new community;

Whereas Annie Glenn gave birth to a son, David, in 1945, and a daughter, Lynn, in 1947;

Whereas Annie Glenn battled a severe stuttering impediment for more than 5 decades;

Whereas, to manage her speech impediment, Annie Glenn developed creative strat-

egies that allowed her to function in public life;

Whereas, in 1973, at the age of 53, Annie Glenn participated in an intensive speech program at the Communications Research Institute at Hollins University in Roanoke, Virginia, that gave her the skills to transform the stutter and become an avid public speaker;

Whereas, following the speech program, Annie Glenn played a leading role during the subsequent political campaigns of her husband, John Glenn;

Whereas, in 1983, Annie Glenn received an award from the American Speech and Hearing Association for “providing an inspiring model for people with communicative disorders”;

Whereas, in 1987, the National Association for Hearing and Speech honored Annie Glenn by presenting the first annual “Annie Glenn Award” for achieving distinction despite having a communicative disorder to actor James Earl Jones;

Whereas other notable recipients of the Annie Glenn Award include actress Julie Andrews, Representative Gabby Giffords, journalist Bob Woodruff, and Vice President Joe Biden;

Whereas Annie Glenn, as an active community member, advocated on behalf of children, the elderly, and individuals with disabilities;

Whereas Annie Glenn served—

(1) as a member of the advisory board for the National Center for Survivors of Childhood Abuse;

(2) on the advisory board for the National First Ladies’ Library;

(3) on the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Advisory Council of the National Institutes of Health; and

(4) as a member of the advisory panel of the Central Ohio Speech and Hearing Association;

Whereas Annie Glenn and John Glenn served on the Board of Trustees of Muskingum University and on the Advisory Board of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs at The Ohio State University;

Whereas Annie Glenn served as a member of the Ohio Women’s Hall of Fame and, in 1999, was inducted into the Hall of Excellence of the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges;

Whereas Annie Glenn had the distinguishing quality of making everyone she encountered feel heard, important, and empowered;

Whereas Annie Glenn made Ohio and the United States proud all her life as an advocate, philanthropist, mother, grandmother, partner, mentor, and friend, and will be remembered for her work to lift others up, including individuals who struggled with communicative disorders; and

Whereas Annie Glenn died on May 19, 2020, at the age of 100 and will be remembered for her legacy in speech and hearing therapy and for her dedication to—

(1) people with communicative disorders;

(2) her family; and

(3) her community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the life, legacy, and achievements of Annie Glenn, a leading advocate for people with communicative disorders.

SENATE RESOLUTION 643—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THE MUSICAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEED FOR GREATER ACCESS TO MUSIC EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AND DESIGNATING JUNE 2020 AS AFRICAN-AMERICAN MUSIC APPRECIATION MONTH

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 643

Whereas spirituals, ragtime, blues, jazz, gospel, classical composition, and countless other categories of music have been created or enhanced by African Americans and are etched into the history and culture of the United States;

Whereas the first Africans transported to the United States came from a variety of ethnic groups with a long history of distinct and cultivated musical traditions, brought musical instruments with them, and built new musical instruments in the United States;

Whereas spirituals were a distinct response to the conditions of African slavery in the United States and expressed the longing of slaves for spiritual and bodily freedom, for safety from harm and evil, and for relief from the hardships of slavery;

Whereas jazz, arguably the most creative and complex music that the United States has produced, combines the musical traditions of African Americans in New Orleans with the creative flexibility of blues music;

Whereas masterful trumpeters Louis Armstrong and Miles Davis achieved national and international recognition with the success of “West End Blues” by Louis Armstrong in the 1920s and “So What” by Miles Davis in the late 1950s;

Whereas talented jazz pianist and vocalist Nathaniel Adams Coles recorded more than 150 singles and sold more than 50,000,000 records;

Whereas the talent of Ella Fitzgerald, a winner of 13 Grammys, is epitomized by a rendition of “Summertime”, a bluesy record accompanied by melodic vocals;

Whereas Natalie Cole, the daughter of Nathaniel Adams Coles, achieved musical success in the mid-1970s as a rhythm and blues artist with the hits “This Will Be” and “Unforgettable”;

Whereas, in the 1940s, bebop evolved through jam sessions, which included trumpeter Dizzy Gillespie and the alto saxophonist Charlie Parker, that were held at clubs in Harlem, New York, such as Minton’s Playhouse;

Whereas earlier classical singers such as Elizabeth Taylor Greenfield, one of the first widely known African-American vocalists, and other early African-American singing pioneers, including Nellie Mitchell Brown, Marie Selika Williams, Rachel Walker Turner, Marian Anderson, and Flora Batson Bergen, paved the way for the female African-American concert singers who have achieved great popularity during the last 50 years;

Whereas the term “rhythm and blues” originated in the late 1940s as a way to describe recordings marketed to African Americans and replaced the term “race music”;

Whereas lyrical themes in rhythm and blues often encapsulate the African-American experience of pain, the quest for freedom, joy, triumphs and failures, relationships, economics, and aspiration and were popularized by artists such as Ray Charles, Ruth Brown, Etta James, and Otis Redding;

Whereas soul music originated in the African-American community in the late 1950s and early 1960s, combines elements of African-American gospel music, rhythm and blues, and jazz, and was popularized by artists such as Aretha Franklin, James Brown, Ray Charles, Sam Cooke, Bill Withers, and Jackie Wilson;

Whereas Motown, founded as a record label in 1959, evolved into a distinctive style known for the "Motown Sound", a blend of pop and soul musical stylings made popular by prominent Black artists such as Marvin Gaye, James Mason, and Mary Wells;

Whereas, in the early 1970s, the musical style of disco emerged and was popularized by programs such as Soul Train and by artists such as Donna Summer;

Whereas reggae is a genre of music that originated in Jamaica in the late 1960s and incorporates some of the musical elements of rhythm and blues, jazz, mento, calypso, and African music, and was popularized by artists such as Bob Marley;

Whereas rock and roll was developed from African-American musical styles such as gospel and rhythm and blues and was popularized by artists such as Chuck Berry, Bo Diddley, Little Richard, and Jimi Hendrix;

Whereas rap, arguably the most complex and influential form of hip-hop culture, combines blues, jazz, and soul, elements of the African-American musical tradition, with Caribbean calypso, dub, and dance hall reggae;

Whereas the development and popularity of old style rap combined confident beats with wordplay and storytelling, highlighting the struggle of African-American youth growing up in underresourced neighborhoods;

Whereas contemporary rhythm and blues, which originated in the late 1970s and combines elements of pop, rhythm and blues, soul, funk, hip hop, gospel, and electronic dance music was popularized by artists such as Whitney Houston and Aaliyah;

Whereas Prince Rogers Nelson, who was known for electric performances and a wide vocal range, pioneered music that integrated a wide variety of styles, including funk, rock, contemporary rhythm and blues, new wave, soul, psychedelia, and pop;

Whereas a recent study by the Department of Education found that only 28 percent of African-American students receive any kind of arts education;

Whereas African-American students scored the lowest of all ethnicities in the most recent National Assessment for Educational Progress arts assessment;

Whereas students who are eligible for the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) have significantly lower scores on the music portion of the National Assessment for Educational Progress arts assessment than students who are ineligible for that program, which suggests that students in low-income families are disadvantaged in the subject of music;

Whereas a recent study found that—

(1) nearly ¾ of music ensemble students were White and middle class, and only 15 percent of those students were African-American; and

(2) only 7 percent of music teacher licensure candidates were African-American; and

Whereas students of color face many barriers to accessing music education and training, especially students in large urban public schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes—

(A) the contributions of African Americans to the musical heritage of the United States;

(B) the wide array of talented and popular African-American musical artists, composers, songwriters, and musicians who are underrecognized for contributions to music;

(C) the achievements, talent, and hard work of African-American pioneer artists and the obstacles that those artists overcame to gain recognition;

(D) the need for African-American students to have greater access to, and participation in, music education in schools across the United States; and

(E) Black History Month and African-American Music Appreciation Month as an important time—

(i) to celebrate the impact of the African-American musical heritage on the musical heritage of the United States; and

(ii) to encourage greater access to music education so that the next generation may continue to greatly contribute to the musical heritage of the United States; and

(2) designates June 2020 as "African-American Music Appreciation Month".

SENATE RESOLUTION 644—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE SHOULD REMAIN A STRONG AND UNIVERSAL SERVICE FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, AND SHOULD RECEIVE AN APPROPRIATION TO OFFSET REVENUES LOST DUE TO THE COVID-19 EMERGENCY

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

S. RES. 644

Whereas the United States Postal Service is, by law, "a basic and fundamental service provided to the people by the Government of the United States, authorized by the Constitution, created by Act of Congress, and supported by the people";

Whereas the United States Postal Service is obligated under the law to "provide prompt, reliable, and efficient services to patrons in all areas" and "render services to all communities", in such a way so that "the costs of the Postal Service shall not be apportioned to impair the overall value of such service to the people";

Whereas the United States Postal Service maintains a universal network that connects all rural, suburban, and urban communities in the United States;

Whereas the United States Postal Service carries necessary correspondence and goods to each community, including prescriptions and critical medications;

Whereas the United States Postal Service uniquely serves "the last mile", delivering to every business and residential customer not fewer than 6 days per week;

Whereas the United States Postal Service helps small businesses stay connected with their customers no matter where they live;

Whereas more than 630,000 employees work for the United States Postal Service, including more than 97,000 military veterans, to carry out this mission; and

Whereas the United States Postal Service is at the center of the mailing industry, which generates \$1,600,000,000,000 annually and employs approximately 7,300,000 individuals in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

(1) that the United States Postal Service—

(A) should not close post offices or facilities, especially in areas that would otherwise lack access to the services these facilities provide;

(B) should not reduce its standards of service, or prevent individuals and businesses in every community from receiving their mail expediently and predictably;

(C) should not unduly or excessively raise the prices of its products or services in such a way as to jeopardize the affordability and accessibility of such products and services in each community across the nation; and

(D) should maintain prompt, reliable, and efficient services to all patrons affordably, as required under the law and by the people of the United States; and

(2) that Congress should appropriate funds to offset lost revenues of the United States Postal Service during the COVID-19 emergency and should take all appropriate measures to ensure the United States Postal Service maintains its services and remains an accessible, independent establishment of the Federal Government.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2389. Mr. SCOTT, of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2390. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2391. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2392. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2393. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2394. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2395. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2396. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2397. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2398. Mr. CRAMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2399. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2400. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2401. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2402. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. MERKLEY)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2403. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2404. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2405. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2406. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2407. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2408. Ms. DUCKWORTH (for Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. DURBIN)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2409. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2410. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2411. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2412. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2413. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2414. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2415. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2416. Ms. WARREN (for Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2417. Ms. CANTWELL (for Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2418. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2419. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2389. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. ____ TRANSFERRING AND EXPANDING THE TROOPS-TO-TEACHERS PROGRAM TO BECOME THE TROOPS-TO-SUPPORT-EDUCATION PROGRAM.

(a) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.—

(1) TRANSFER.—The responsibility and authority for operation and administration of the program under section 1154 of title 10, United States Code, is transferred from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Education.

(2) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—In connection with the transfer of responsibility and authority for operation and administration of the Troops-to-Support-Education Program (as redesignated by this section) from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Education under paragraph (1), the Secretaries shall enter into a memorandum of agreement describing the duties of each Secretary to support the program, including how the Secretaries will effectuate the reimbursement provisions under section 2251(f) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The transfer of responsibility and authority for operation and administration of the Troops-to-Support-Education Program under paragraph (1) shall take effect—

(A) on the first day of the first month beginning more than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) on such earlier date as the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Defense may jointly provide.

(b) TRANSFER, REDESIGNATION, AND EXPANSION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (29 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 2003(b) (20 U.S.C. 6603(b)), by inserting “(except for subpart 5)” after “part B”; and

(B) in part B, by adding at the end the following:

“Subpart 5—Troops-to-Support-Education Program

“SEC. 2251. ASSISTANCE TO ELIGIBLE MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS TO OBTAIN EMPLOYMENT IN SCHOOLS; TROOPS-TO-SUPPORT-EDUCATION PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ARMED FORCES.—The term ‘Armed Forces’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

“(2) CHARTER SCHOOL.—The term ‘charter school’ has the meaning given that term in section 4310.

“(3) ELIGIBLE SCHOOL.—The term ‘eligible school’ means—

“(A) a public school, including a charter school, at which—

“(i) at least 30 percent of the students enrolled in the school are from families with incomes below 185 percent of poverty level (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised at least annually in accordance with section 9(b)(1) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(1)) applicable to a family of the size involved; or

“(ii) at least 13 percent of the students enrolled in the school qualify for assistance under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.); or

“(B) a Bureau-funded school as defined in section 1141(3) of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2021(3)).

“(4) HIGH-NEED SCHOOL.—The term ‘high-need school’ means—

“(A) an elementary school or middle school in which at least 50 percent of the enrolled students are children from low-income families, based on the number of children eligible for free and reduced-priced lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), the number of children in families receiving assistance under the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the number of children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program, or a composite of these indicators;

“(B) a high school in which at least 40 percent of enrolled students are children from low-income families, which may be calculated using comparable data from feeder schools; or

“(C) a school that is in a local educational agency that is eligible under section 5211(b).

“(5) MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES.—The term ‘member of the Armed Forces’ includes a retired or former member of the Armed Forces.

“(6) PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘participant’ means an eligible member of the Armed Forces selected to participate in the Program.

“(7) PROGRAM.—The term ‘Program’ means the Troops-to-Support-Education Program authorized by this section.

“(8) QUALIFYING POSITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘qualifying position’ means any full-time position in an eligible school, including a position as—

“(i) a teacher, including an elementary school teacher, a secondary school teacher, or a career or technical education teacher;

“(ii) a school resource officer;

“(iii) a school leader;

“(iv) specialized instructional support personnel;

“(v) a paraprofessional; or

“(vi) other staff.

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘qualifying position’ does not include a position that is—

“(i) performed primarily at a location outside the grounds of an eligible school; or

“(ii) held by an individual who is employed by a contractor.

“(9) SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER.—The term ‘school resource officer’ has the meaning given that term in section 1709(4) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10389(4)).

“(10) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Education.

“(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may carry out a Troops-to-Support-Education Program—

“(1) to assist eligible members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (d) to meet the requirements necessary to obtain a qualifying position in a school described in paragraph (2); and

“(2) to facilitate the employment of such members—

“(A) by local educational agencies or charter schools that the Secretary identifies as—

“(i) receiving grants under part A of title I as a result of having within their jurisdictions concentrations of children from low-income families;

“(ii) experiencing a shortage of teachers, in particular a shortage of science, mathematics, special education, foreign language, or career or technical teachers; or

“(iii) experiencing a shortage of personnel to fill qualifying positions; and

“(B) in elementary schools or secondary schools, or as career or technical teachers.

“(c) COUNSELING AND REFERRAL SERVICES.—The Secretary may provide counseling and referral services to members of the Armed Forces who do not meet the eligibility criteria described in subsection (d), including the education qualification requirements under paragraph (3)(B) of such subsection.

“(d) ELIGIBILITY AND APPLICATION PROCESSES.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.—The following members of the Armed Forces are eligible for selection to participate in the Program:

“(A) Any member who—

“(i) on or after October 1, 1999, becomes entitled to retired or retainer pay under title 10, or title 14, of the United States Code;

“(ii) has an approved date of retirement that is within one year after the date on which the member submits an application to participate in the Program; or

“(iii) has been transferred to the Retired Reserve.

“(B) Any member who, on or after January 8, 2002—

“(i) is separated or released from active duty after 4 or more years of continuous active duty immediately before the separation or release; or

“(ii) has completed a total of at least 6 years of active duty service, 6 years of service computed under section 12732 of title 10, United States Code, or 6 years of any combination of such service; and

“(ii) executes a reserve commitment agreement for a period of not less than 3 years under paragraph (5)(B).

“(C) Any member who, on or after January 8, 2002, is retired or separated for physical disability under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code.

“(2) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Selection of eligible members of the Armed Forces to participate in the Program shall be made on the basis of applications submitted to the Secretary within the time periods specified in subparagraph (B). An application shall be in such form and contain such information as the Secretary may require.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case of an eligible member of the Armed Forces described in subparagraph (A)(i), (A)(iii), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1), an application shall be considered to be submitted on a timely basis if the application is submitted not later than 3 years after the date on which the member is retired, transferred to the Retired Reserve, or separated or released from active duty, whichever applies to the member.

“(3) SELECTION CRITERIA; EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND REQUIREMENTS; HONORABLE SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe the criteria to be used to select eligible members of the Armed Forces to participate in the Program.

“(B) PLACEMENT AS ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHER.—If a member of the Armed Forces is applying for the Program to receive assistance for placement as an elementary school or secondary school teacher, the Secretary shall require the member to have received a baccalaureate or advanced degree from an institution of higher education.

“(C) PLACEMENT AS CAREER OR TECHNICAL TEACHER.—If a member of the Armed Forces is applying for the Program to receive assistance for placement as a career or technical teacher, the Secretary shall require the member—

“(i) to have received the equivalent of 1 year of postsecondary education from an institution of higher education or the equivalent in military education and training as certified by the Department of Defense; or

“(ii) to otherwise meet the certification or licensing requirements for a career or technical teacher in the State in which the member seeks assistance for placement under the Program.

“(D) PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS.—If a member of the Armed Forces is applying for the Program to receive assistance for placement in a qualifying position other than a position as a teacher described in subparagraph (B) or (C), the Secretary shall require the member to obtain the professional credentials that are required by the State for the position involved.

“(E) HONORABLE SERVICE.—A member of the Armed Forces is eligible to participate in the Program only if the member’s last period of service in the Armed Forces was honorable, as characterized by the Secretary concerned. A member selected to participate in the Program before the retirement of the member, the transfer of the member to the Retired Reserve, or the separation or release of the member from active duty may continue to participate in the Program after the retirement, transfer, separation, or release only if the member’s last period of service is characterized as honorable by the Secretary concerned.

“(4) SELECTION PRIORITIES.—In selecting eligible members of the Armed Forces to receive assistance under the Program, the Secretary—

“(A) shall give priority to members who—

“(i) have educational or military experience in science, mathematics, special education, foreign language, or career or technical subjects; and

“(ii) agree to seek employment as science, mathematics, foreign language, or special education teachers in elementary schools or secondary schools or in other schools under the jurisdiction of a local educational agency; and

“(B) may give priority to members who agree to seek employment in a high-need school.

“(5) OTHER CONDITIONS ON SELECTION.—

“(A) APPROPRIATIONS REQUIRED.—Subject to subsection (i), the Secretary may not select an eligible member of the Armed Forces to participate in the Program and receive financial assistance unless the Secretary has sufficient appropriations for the Program available at the time of the selection to satisfy the obligations to be incurred by the United States under subsection (e) with respect to the member.

“(B) WRITTEN AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary may not select an eligible member of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) to participate in the Program and receive financial assistance under subsection (e) unless the member executes a written agreement to serve as a member of the Selected Reserve of a reserve component of the Armed Forces for a period of not less than 3 years.

“(e) PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible member of the Armed Forces selected to participate in the Program under subsection (b) and to receive financial assistance under this subsection shall be required to enter into an agreement with the Secretary in which the member agrees—

“(i) within such time as the Secretary may require, to meet the requirements necessary to obtain a qualifying position in a school described in subsection (b)(2); and

“(ii) to accept an offer of full-time employment in a qualifying position for not less than 3 school years in an eligible school to begin the school year after the member obtains the professional credentials required for the position involved.

“(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the 3-year commitment described in subparagraph (A)(ii) for a participant if the Secretary determines such waiver to be appropriate. If the Secretary provides the waiver, the participant shall not be considered to be in violation of the agreement and shall not be required to provide reimbursement under subsection (f), for failure to meet the 3-year commitment.

“(2) VIOLATION OF PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT; EXCEPTIONS.—A participant shall not be considered to be in violation of the participation agreement entered into under paragraph (1) during any period in which the participant—

“(A) is pursuing a full-time course of study related to the field of teaching at an institution of higher education;

“(B) is serving on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces;

“(C) is temporarily totally disabled for a period of time not to exceed 3 years as established by sworn affidavit of a qualified physician;

“(D) is unable to secure employment for a period not to exceed 12 months by reason of the care required by a spouse who is disabled;

“(E) is unable to find full-time employment in a qualifying position for a single period not to exceed 27 months; or

“(F) satisfies the provisions of additional reimbursement exceptions that may be prescribed by the Secretary.

“(3) STIPEND AND BONUS FOR PARTICIPANTS.—

“(A) STIPEND AVAILABLE.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Secretary may pay to a participant a stipend to cover expenses incurred by the participant to obtain the required educational level, certification, licensing, or other professional credentials. Such stipend may not exceed \$5,000 and may vary by participant.

“(B) BONUS AVAILABLE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Secretary may pay a bonus to a participant who agrees in the participation agreement under paragraph (1) to accept full-time employment in a qualifying position for not less than 3 school years in an eligible school.

“(ii) AMOUNT OF BONUS.—The amount of the bonus may not exceed \$5,000, unless the eligible school is a high-need school, in which case the amount of the bonus may not exceed \$10,000. Within such limits, the bonus may vary by participant and may take into account the priority placements as determined by the Secretary.

“(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) TOTAL NUMBER OF STIPENDS.—The total number of stipends that may be paid under subparagraph (A) in any fiscal year may not exceed 7,500.

“(ii) TOTAL NUMBER OF BONUSES.—The total number of bonuses that may be paid under subparagraph (B) in any fiscal year may not exceed 4,500.

“(iii) EXCEPTION.—A participant may not receive a stipend under subparagraph (A) if the participant is eligible for benefits under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code.

“(iv) TOTAL LIMITATION.—The combination of a stipend under subparagraph (A) and a bonus under subparagraph (B) for any one participant may not exceed \$10,000.

“(4) TREATMENT OF STIPEND AND BONUS.—A stipend or bonus paid under this subsection to a participant shall be taken into account in determining the eligibility of the participant for Federal student financial assistance provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

“(f) REIMBURSEMENT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—

“(1) REIMBURSEMENT REQUIRED.—A participant who is paid a stipend or bonus under this section shall be subject to the repayment provisions of section 373 of title 37, United States Code, under the following circumstances:

“(A) The participant fails to meet the requirements necessary to obtain a qualifying position in a school described in subsection (b)(2) or to obtain employment in a qualifying position as required by the participation agreement under subsection (e)(1).

“(B) The participant voluntarily leaves, or is terminated for cause from, employment in a qualifying position during the 3 years of required service in violation of the participation agreement.

“(C) The participant executed a written agreement with the Secretary concerned under subsection (d)(5)(B) to serve as a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces for a period of 3 years and fails to complete the required term of service.

“(2) AMOUNT OF REIMBURSEMENT.—A participant required to reimburse the Secretary for a stipend or bonus paid to the participant under subsection (e) shall pay an amount that bears the same ratio to the amount of the stipend or bonus as the unserved portion of required service bears to the 3 years of required service.

“(3) INTEREST.—Any amount owed by a participant under this subsection shall bear

interest at the rate equal to the highest rate being paid by the United States on the day on which the reimbursement is determined to be due for securities having maturities of 90 days or less and shall accrue from the day on which the participant is first notified of the amount due.

“(4) EXCEPTIONS TO REIMBURSEMENT REQUIREMENT.—A participant shall be excused from reimbursement under this subsection if the participant becomes permanently totally disabled as established by sworn affidavit of a qualified physician. The Secretary may also waive the reimbursement in cases of extreme hardship to the participant, as determined by the Secretary.

“(g) RELATIONSHIP TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE UNDER MONTGOMERY GI BILL.—Except as provided in subsection (e)(3)(C)(iii), the receipt by a participant of a stipend or bonus under subsection (e) shall not reduce or otherwise affect the entitlement of the participant to any benefits under chapter 30 or 33 of title 38 or chapter 1606 of title 10, United States Code.

“(h) PARTICIPATION BY STATES.—

“(1) DISCHARGE OF STATE ACTIVITIES THROUGH CONSORTIA OF STATES.—The Secretary may permit States participating in the Program to carry out activities authorized for such States under the Program through one or more consortia of such States.

“(2) ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—

“(A) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may make grants to States participating in the Program, or to consortia of such States, in order to permit such States or consortia of States to operate offices for purposes of recruiting eligible members of the Armed Forces for participation in the Program and facilitating the employment of participants in qualifying positions.

“(B) GRANT LIMIT.—The total amount of grants made under subparagraph (A) in any fiscal year may not exceed \$5,000,000.

“(i) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into one or more partnerships with nonprofit entities, including veterans service organizations, to assist with the placement of participants in eligible schools in accordance with this section.

“(2) NONPROFIT ENTITY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘nonprofit entity’ means an entity qualifying as an exempt organization under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(j) LIMITATION ON TOTAL FISCAL-YEAR OBLIGATIONS.—The total amount obligated by the Secretary under the Program for any fiscal year may not exceed \$20,000,000.

“(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2023.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2245 the following:

SUBPART 5—TROOPS-TO-SUPPORT-EDUCATION PROGRAM

Sec. 2251. Assistance to eligible members and former members to obtain employment in schools: Troops-to-Support-Education Program.

(c) REFERENCES.—Any reference in Federal law (other than this Act), regulations, guidance, instructions, or other documents of the Federal Government to the Troops-to-Teachers Program shall be deemed to be a reference to the Troops-to-Support-Education Program.

(d) TERMINATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TROOPS-TO-TEACHERS PROGRAM.—

(1) TERMINATION.—Subject to paragraph (3), section 1154 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Chapter 58 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by redesignating section 1155 as section 1154.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 58 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to section 1154; and

(ii) by redesignating the item relating to section 1155 as the item relating to section 1154.

(3) EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—The repeal of section 1154 of title 10, United States Code, by paragraph (1) shall not affect—

(A) the validity or terms of any agreement entered into under such section, as in effect immediately before such repeal, before the effective date of the transfer of the program under subsection (a); or

(B) the authority to pay assistance, make grants, or obtain reimbursement in connection with such an agreement as in effect before the effective date of the transfer of such program under subsection (a).

SA 2390. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 1242. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON INCREASED ROTATIONAL DEPLOYMENTS TO GREECE AND ENHANCEMENT OF UNITED STATES-GREECE DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.

(a) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the feasibility of increased rotational deployments of members of the Armed Forces to Greece, including to Souda Bay, Alexandroupoli, Larissa, Volos, and Stefanovikeio.

(2) ELEMENT.—The study required by paragraph (1) shall include an evaluation of any infrastructure investment necessary to support such increased rotational deployments.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the study required by paragraph (1).

(b) DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.—The Secretary of State is encouraged to pursue persistent United States diplomatic engagement with respect to the Greece-Cyprus-Israel and Greece-Cyprus-Egypt trilateral agreements beyond the occasional participation of United States diplomats in the regular summits of the countries party to such agreements.

SA 2391. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal

year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 520. REPORTS ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REPORT ON FINDINGS OF DEFENSE BOARD ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION IN THE MILITARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the completion by the Defense Board on Diversity and Inclusion in the Military of its report on actionable recommendations to increase racial diversity and ensure equal opportunity across all grades of the Armed Forces, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the report of the Defense Board, including the findings and recommendations of the Defense Board.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A comprehensive description of the findings and recommendations of the Defense Board in its report referred to in paragraph (1).

(B) A comprehensive description of any actionable recommendations of the Defense Board in its report.

(C) A description of the actions proposed to be undertaken by the Secretary in connection with such recommendations, and a timeline for implementation of such actions.

(D) A description of the resources used by the Defense Board for its report, and a description and assessment of any shortfalls in such resources for purposes of the Defense Board.

(b) REPORT ON DEFENSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION IN THE ARMED FORCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the same time the Secretary of Defense submits the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall also submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the Defense Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion in the Armed Forces.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The mission statement or purpose of the Advisory Committee, and any proposed objectives and goals of the Advisory Committee.

(B) A description of current members of the Advisory Committee and the criteria used for selecting members.

(C) A description of the duties and scope of activities of the Advisory Committee.

(D) The reporting structure of the Advisory Committee.

(E) An estimate of the annual operating costs and staff years of the Advisory Committee.

(F) An estimate of the number and frequency of meetings of the Advisory Committee.

(G) Any subcommittees, established or proposed, that would support the Advisory Committee.

(H) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate to extend the term of the Advisory Committee beyond the proposed termination date of the Advisory Committee.

(c) REPORT ON CURRENT DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION IN THE ARMED FORCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the same time the Secretary of Defense submits the reports required by subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall also submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on current diversity and inclusion in the Armed Forces.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An identification of the current racial, ethnic, and sex composition of each Armed Force generally.

(B) An identification of the current racial, ethnic, and sex composition of each Armed Force by grade.

(C) A comparison of the participation rates of minority populations in officer grades, warrant officer grades, and enlisted member grades in each Armed Force with the percentage of such populations among the general population.

(D) A comparison of the participation rates of minority populations in each career field in each Armed Force with the percentage of such populations among the general population.

(E) A comparison among the Armed Forces of the percentage of minority populations in each officer grade above grade O-4.

(F) A comparison among the Armed Forces of the percentage of minority populations in each enlisted grade above grade E-6.

(G) A description and assessment of barriers to minority participation in the Armed Forces in connection with accession, assessment, and training.

(d) SENSE OF SENATE ON DEFENSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION IN THE ARMED FORCES.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Defense Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion in the Armed Forces—

(1) should consist of diverse group of individuals, including—

(A) a general or flag officer from each regular component of the Armed Forces;

(B) a retired general or flag officer from not fewer than two of the Armed Forces;

(C) a regular officer of the Armed Forces in a grade O-5 or lower;

(D) a regular enlisted member of the Armed Forces in a grade E-7 or higher;

(E) a regular enlisted member of the Armed Forces in a grade E-6 or lower;

(F) a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces in any grade;

(G) a member of the Department of Defense civilian workforce;

(H) an member of the academic community with expertise in diversity studies; and

(I) an individual with appropriate expertise in diversity and inclusion;

(2) should include individuals from a variety of military career paths, including—

(A) aviation;

(B) special operations;

(C) intelligence;

(D) cyber;

(E) space; and

(F) surface warfare;

(3) should have a membership such that not fewer than 20 percent of members possess—

(A) a firm understanding of the role of mentorship and best practices in finding and utilizing mentors;

(B) experience and expertise in change of culture of large organizations; or

(C) experience and expertise in implementation science; and

(4) should focus on objectives that address—

(A) barriers to promotion within the Armed Forces, including development of recommendations on mechanisms to enhance and increase racial diversity and ensure equal opportunity across all grades in the Armed Forces;

(B) participation of minority officers and senior noncommissioned officers in the Armed Forces, including development of recommendations on mechanisms to enhance and increase such participation;

(C) recruitment of minority candidates for innovative pre-service programs in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC), Senior Reserve Officers' Training

Corps (SROTC), and military service academies, including programs in connection with flight instruction, special operations, and national security, including development of recommendations on mechanisms to enhance and increase such recruitment;

(D) retention of minority individuals in senior leadership and mentorship positions in the Armed Forces, including development of recommendations on mechanisms to enhance and increase such retention; and

(E) achievement of cultural and ethnic diversity in recruitment for the Armed Forces, including development of recommendations on mechanisms to enhance and increase such diversity in recruitment.

SA 2392. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CISA DIRECTOR.

Subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 5313, by inserting after the item relating to “Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration” the following:

“Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency.”; and

(2) in section 5314, by striking the item relating to “Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency.”.

SEC. ____ . AGENCY REVIEW.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.—In order to strengthen the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall conduct a comprehensive review of the ability of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to fulfill—

(1) the missions of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency; and

(2) the recommendations detailed in the report issued by the Cyberspace Solarium Commission under section 1652(k) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232).

(b) ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.—The review conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An assessment of how additional budget resources could be used by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency for projects and programs that—

(A) support the national risk management mission;

(B) promote public-private integration; and

(C) provide situational awareness of cybersecurity threats.

(2) A comprehensive force structure assessment of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency including—

(A) a determination of the appropriate size and composition of personnel to accomplish the mission of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, as well as the recommendations detailed in the report issued by the Cyberspace Solarium Commission under section 1652(k) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232);

(B) an assessment of whether existing personnel are appropriately matched to the

prioritization of threats in the cyber domain and risks in critical infrastructure;

(C) an assessment of whether the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency has the appropriate personnel and resources to—

(i) perform risk assessments, threat hunting, incident response to support both private and public cybersecurity;

(ii) carry out the responsibilities of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency related to the security of Federal information and Federal information systems; and

(iii) carry out the critical infrastructure responsibilities of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, including national risk management; and

(D) an assessment of whether current structure, personnel, and resources of regional field offices are sufficient in fulfilling agency responsibilities and mission requirements.

(c) **SUBMISSION OF REVIEW.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to Congress detailing the results of the assessments required under subsection (b), including recommendations to address any identified gaps.

SEC. ____ . GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION REVIEW.

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Administrator of the General Services Administration shall—

(1) conduct a review of current Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency facilities and assess the suitability of such facilities to fully support current and projected mission requirements nationally and regionally; and

(2) make recommendations regarding resources needed to procure or build a new facility or augment existing facilities to ensure sufficient size and accommodations to fully support current and projected mission requirements, including the integration of personnel from the private sector and other departments and agencies.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF REVIEW.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall submit the review required under subsection (a) to—

- (1) the President;
- (2) the Secretary of Homeland Security; and
- (3) to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SA 2393. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1052. TRANSFER OF F-4 PHANTOM FIGHTER AIRCRAFT TO THE CLASSIC AIRCRAFT AVIATION MUSEUM, HILLSBORO, OREGON.

(a) **TRANSFER REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall transfer, without consideration, to the Classic Aircraft Aviation Museum, Hillsboro, Oregon (in this section referred to as the “Museum”), the following:

(1) Any F-4 Phantom fighter aircraft airframe in flightworthy condition that is de-

termined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Museum, to be suitable for transfer.

(2) Two operational engines in flightworthy condition and suitable for utilization in the airframe transferred under paragraph (1) that are determined by the Secretary to be suitable for transfer.

(3) Such avionics, rotatable components (including wheels, tires, and brakes), radar, and other subcomponents for F-4 Phantom fighter aircraft as the Secretary, in consultation with the Museum, determines to be appropriate for the maintenance of the historical integrity and safety of the airframe transferred under paragraph (1) while in operation.

(b) **TRANSFER OF ADDITIONAL ENGINES.**—Upon request of the Museum following a determination by the Museum that an engine transferred under subsection (a)(2), or under this subsection, is no longer maintainable by the Museum in a flightworthy condition, the Secretary shall transfer, without consideration, to the Museum an operational engine that is in flightworthy condition and suitable for utilization in the airframe transferred under subsection (a)(1) if such an engine is available for transfer.

(c) **NON-COMBAT CAPABLE.**—The airframe and engines transferred under this section shall be appropriately altered so as to be non-combat capable after transfer. However, no such alteration shall impair or impede the flightworthiness of the airframe or engines after transfer.

(d) **CONDITIONS.**—As conditions for the transfer of the airframe and engines authorized by this section, the Museum shall agree as follows:

(1) To fully indemnify the United States for any and all liabilities arising in connection with the transfer.

(2) To not transfer the airframe or engines to another party without the advance, written approval of the Secretary.

(e) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the transfers required by this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SA 2394. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE XLVIII—AMENDMENTS TO THE SOAR ACT

SEC. 4801. AMENDMENTS TO THE SOAR ACT.

The Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112-10) is amended—

(1) in section 3007 (sec. 38-1853.07 D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in subsection (a)(5)(A)(i), by striking subclause (I) and inserting the following:

“(I) is fully accredited by an accrediting body with jurisdiction in the District of Columbia or that is recognized by the Student and Visitor Exchange English Language Program administered by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; or”;

(B) by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c);

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “AND PARENTAL ASSISTANCE” and inserting

“, PARENTAL ASSISTANCE, AND STUDENT ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE”;

(ii) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$2,200,000”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The expenses of providing tutoring service to participating eligible students that need additional academic assistance. If there are insufficient funds to provide tutoring services to all such students in a year, the eligible entity shall give priority in such year to students who previously attended an elementary school or secondary school identified as one of the lowest-performing schools under the District of Columbia’s accountability system.”; and

(D) in subsection (c), as redesignated by subparagraph (B)—

(i) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “subsections (b) and (c)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “subsections (b) and (c)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(2) in section 3008(h) (sec. 38-1853.08(h) D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 3009(a)(2)(A)(i)” and inserting “section 3009(a)”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **ADMINISTRATION OF TESTS.**—The Institute of Education Sciences may administer assessments to students participating in the evaluation under section 3009(a) for the purpose of conducting the evaluation under such section.”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “the nationally norm-referenced standardized test described in paragraph (2)” and inserting “a nationally norm-referenced standardized test”;

(3) in section 3009(a) (sec. 38-1853.09(a) D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “annually” and inserting “regularly”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) is rigorous; and”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “impact of the program” and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting “impact of the program on academic progress and educational attainment.”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “ON EDUCATION” and inserting “OF EDUCATION”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “the academic progress of” after “assess”; and

(II) by striking “in each of grades 3” and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(iv) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “A comparison of the academic achievement of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship on the measurements described in paragraph (3)(B) to the academic achievement” and inserting “The academic progress of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship compared to the academic progress”; and

(II) by inserting “, which may include students” after “students with similar backgrounds”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “increasing the satisfaction of such parents and students with their choice” and inserting “those parents’ and students’ satisfaction with the program”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (D) through (F) and inserting the following:

“(D) The high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship compared with the rates of public school students described in subparagraph (A), to the extent practicable.

“(E) The college enrollment rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of students who participated in the program as the result of winning the Opportunity Scholarship Program lottery compared to the enrollment, persistence, and graduation rates for students who entered but did not win such lottery and who, as a result, served as the control group for previous evaluations of the program under this division. Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to waive section 3004(a)(3)(A)(iii) with respect to any such student.

“(F) The safety of the schools attended by participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship compared with the schools attended by public school students described in subparagraph (A), to the extent practicable.”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (G), by striking “achievement” and inserting “progress”; and

(4) in section 3014 (sec. 38–1853.14, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2012 and for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2019” and inserting “\$75,000,000 for fiscal year 2020 and for each succeeding fiscal year”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “\$60,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”.

SA 2395. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. ____ . TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY TARGETS.

During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date that is 18 months after that date of enactment, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may waive the requirements under subparagraph (I) of section 7(j)(10) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(j)(10)) for small business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)) participating in the program established under such section 7(j)(10) to attain targeted dollar levels of revenue outside of the program.

SA 2396. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle H—Sanctions With Respect to the Russian Federation

SEC. 1291. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.**—The terms “admission”, “admitted”, and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “financial institution” means a financial institution specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (M), or (Y) of section 5312(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code.

(4) **FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “foreign financial institution” has the meaning given that term in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(5) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(6) **UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “United States financial institution” has the meaning given that term in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(7) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) 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.

SEC. 1292. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION RELATING TO BOUNTIES ON MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND ALLIED FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) **CERTIFICATION AND REPORT.**—

(1) **CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a certification with respect to—

(A) whether or not the Government of the Russian Federation, or proxies of that Government, was responsible for offering bounties for the killing of members of the Armed Forces of the United States or members of the Resolute Support Mission led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (commonly referred to as “NATO”) in Afghanistan;

(B) whether the information described in subparagraph (A) was provided to—

(i) senior officials of the United States Government, including the President and the Vice President, and, if so, when that information was provided to those officials; and

(ii) allies of the United States serving in Afghanistan under the NATO-led Resolute Support Mission.

(2) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this

Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report describing the measures taken by the Department of Defense to provide greater protection to members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Afghanistan.

(3) **FORM.**—The certification required by paragraph (1) and the report required by paragraph (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(b) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Director of National Intelligence certifies under subsection (a)(1)(A) that the Government of the Russian Federation or any of its proxies was responsible for bounties described in that subsection, the President shall, not later than 15 days after the date of the certification, impose the following sanctions:

(A) **ASSET BLOCKING.**—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of each person described in paragraph (2) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) **ALIENS INADMISSIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(i) **VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—An alien described in paragraph (2) is—

(I) inadmissible to the United States;

(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(ii) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—The visa or other entry documentation of an alien described in paragraph (2) shall be revoked, regardless of when such visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(II) **IMMEDIATE EFFECT.**—A revocation under subclause (I) shall—

(aa) take effect immediately; and

(bb) automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(C) **REJECTION OF TRANSACTIONS WITH DEFENSE AND INTELLIGENCE SECTORS OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct all United States financial institutions to reject all financial transactions involving any person on the list, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, produced by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 231(e) of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9525(e)).

(2) **PERSONS DESCRIBED.**—A person described in this paragraph is any of the following:

(A) Vladimir Putin or any person acting for or on behalf of Vladimir Putin, including any person managing any of his assets anywhere in the world.

(B) Any senior official of the Government of the Russian Federation determined by the President to have been involved in the activity described in subsection (a)(1)(A).

(C) Any official of a defense or intelligence unit of that Government, including the Main Intelligence Agency of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation, if that unit is determined by the President to have been involved in the activity described in subsection (a)(1)(A).

SEC. 1293. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS WITH CERTAIN RUSSIAN POLITICAL FIGURES AND OLIGARCHS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of each person described in subsection (b), if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(b) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The persons described in this subsection are—

(1) political figures, oligarchs, and other persons that facilitate illicit and corrupt activities, directly or indirectly, on behalf of the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, and persons acting for or on behalf of such political figures, oligarchs, and persons;

(2) Russian parastatal entities that facilitate illicit and corrupt activities, directly or indirectly, on behalf of the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin;

(3) family members of persons described in paragraph (1) or (2) that derive significant benefits from such illicit and corrupt activities; and

(4) persons, including financial institutions, that knowingly engage in significant transactions with persons described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

(c) UPDATED REPORT ON OLIGARCHS AND PARASTATAL ENTITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—Section 241 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44; 131 Stat. 922) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) UPDATED REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an updated report on oligarchs and parastatal entities of the Russian Federation that builds on the report submitted under subsection (a) on January 29, 2018, by—

“(1) including the matters described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (a); and

“(2) excluding from the portion of the report responsive to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) any individual with respect to which there is no credible information suggesting the individual has the close financial or political relationships, or engages in the illicit activities, described in subsection (a).”;

(3) in subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “The report required under subsection (a)” and inserting “The reports required by subsections (a) and (b).”;

(d) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a strategy describing how the President will coordinate with the European Union and its individual member countries with respect to efforts to deny Russian persons described in the updated report required by subsection (b) of section 241 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, as amended by subsection (c), access to finan-

cial institutions or real estate in the European Union or United States.

SEC. 1294. IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to the extent necessary to carry out this subtitle.

(b) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of the provisions of subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 1292(b)(1) or section 1293(a), or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out such provisions, shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

SEC. 1295. EXCEPTIONS.

(a) INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—This subtitle shall not apply with respect to activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under section 1292(b)(1)(B) shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary—

(1) to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations; or

(2) to carry out or assist law enforcement activity in the United States.

(c) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions under this subtitle shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(2) GOOD DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “good” means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(d) EXCEPTION RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This subtitle shall not apply with respect to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subtitle or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

(A) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

(B) any other non-Department of Defense customer.

SEC. 1296. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed—

(1) to supersede the limitations or exceptions on the use of rocket engines for national security purposes under section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3626; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note), as amended by section 1607 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1100) and section 1602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2582); or

(2) to prohibit a contractor or subcontractor of the Department of Defense from acquiring components referred to in such section 1608.

SA 2397. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following:

SEC. 333. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INCLUSION OF CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN MQ-25 STINGRAY PROGRAM.

It is the sense of Congress that, when identifying military installations for the MQ-25 Stingray, the Secretary of the Navy should assess the suitability of military installations that—

(1) support at least one Navy Reserve strike fighter squadron; and

(2) do not currently have aircraft assigned that have air refueling as their primary mission.

SA 2398. Mr. CRAMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON USE OF COMMERCIAL SOLUTIONS FOR WIDEBAND SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS ROAMING AND MULTIDOMAIN COMMAND AND CONTROL CAPABILITIES.

No later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for integrating a digital ground architecture that will utilize commercial innovations and solutions to enable wideband satellite communications users to transition between systems and networks and multidomain command and control capabilities without unnecessary additional investment in terminal hardware.

SA 2399. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal

year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1003. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON CERTAIN EFFORTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—No later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the progress of the Department of the Defense in modernizing its financial management enterprise.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include following:

(1) A description of the actions taken by the Department of Defense as part of the implementation of the Digital Modernization Strategy to modernize the data, architecture, and systems comprising its financial management enterprise.

(2) The name of each financial management system in use by the Department, and an annotation of the data for which such system is the official system of record.

(3) The anticipated date of retirement for each system named pursuant to paragraph (2) that is planned to be retired.

(4) A summary of the retirement plan for any system that will be retired, including the manner in which data in such system will be transferred to a different system.

(5) In the case of a system that is not planned for retirement, a justification of the determination not to retire such system.

(6) The amount spent by the Department on operating and maintaining financial management systems during the five fiscal years ending with fiscal year 2020.

(7) The amount spent by the Department on acquiring or developing new financial management systems during such five fiscal years.

SA 2400. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. RESTRICTING THE USE OF EQUIPMENT BY U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION TO SUPPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SURVEILLANCE OF PROTESTS, ACTS OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE, OR SIMILAR ACTS PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT.

Section 2 of the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-367; 8 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF EQUIPMENT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no office, unit, or subdivision of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may use, or transfer or make available to Federal, State, local, Tribal, or territorial law enforcement or other civil authorities for their use, any equipment for the surveillance of protests, acts of civil disobedience, or similar acts protected by the First Amendment within the United States for domestic law enforcement purposes.”.

SA 2401. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr.

INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FEDERAL REGISTER MODERNIZATION.

(a) **REFERENCES TO PRINTING.**—Chapter 15 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1502—

(A) in the heading, by striking “**printing**” and inserting “**publishing**”; and

(B) by striking “**printing and distribution**” and inserting “**publishing**”; and

(2) in section 1507—

(A) by striking “the duplicate originals or certified copies of the document have” and inserting “the document has”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “**printed**” and inserting “**published**”; and

(3) in section 1509, in subsections (a) and (b), by striking “**printing, reprinting, wrapping, binding, and distributing**” and inserting “**publishing**”, each place it appears.

(b) **PUBLISH DEFINED.**—Section 1501 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “; and” at the end of the definition for “**person**” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by inserting after the definition for “**person**” the following:

“‘**publish**’ means to circulate for sale or distribution to the public; and”.

(c) **FILING DOCUMENTS WITH OFFICE AMENDMENT.**—Section 1503 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“**§1503. Filing documents with Office; notation of time; public inspection; transmission for publishing**

“The original document required or authorized to be published by section 1505 shall be filed with the Office of the Federal Register for publication at times established by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register by regulation. The Archivist of the United States shall cause to be noted on the original of each document the day and hour of filing. Upon filing, the document shall be immediately available for public inspection in the Office. The original shall be retained by the National Archives and Records Administration and shall be available for inspection under regulations prescribed by the Archivist, unless such original is disposed of in accordance with disposal schedules submitted by the Administrative Committee and authorized by the Archivist pursuant to regulations issued under chapter 33; however, originals of proclamations of the President and Executive orders shall be permanently retained by the Administration as part of the National Archives of the United States. The Office shall transmit to the Government Publishing Office, as provided by this chapter, each document required or authorized to be published by section 1505. Every Federal agency shall cause to be transmitted for filing the original of all such documents issued, prescribed, or promulgated by the agency.”.

(d) **FEDERAL REGISTER AMENDMENT.**—Section 1504 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“**§1504. ‘Federal Register’; publishing; contents; distribution; price**

“Documents required or authorized to be published by section 1505 shall be published immediately by the Government Publishing Office in a serial publication designated the ‘Federal Register’. The Director of the Gov-

ernment Publishing Office shall make available the facilities of the Government Publishing Office for the prompt publication of the Federal Register in the manner and at the times required by this chapter and the regulations prescribed under it. The contents of the daily issues shall be indexed and constitute all documents, required or authorized to be published, filed with the Office of the Federal Register up to the time of the day immediately preceding the day of publication fixed by regulations under this chapter. There shall be published with each document a copy of the notation, required to be made by section 1503, of the day and hour when, upon filing with the Office, the document was made available for public inspection. Distribution shall be made at a time in the morning of the day of distribution fixed by regulations prescribed under this chapter. The prices to be charged for the Federal Register may be fixed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register established by section 1506 without reference to the restrictions placed upon and fixed for the sale of Government publications by sections 1705 and 1708.”.

(e) **DOCUMENTS TO BE PUBLISHED IN FEDERAL REGISTER.**—Section 1505 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “**COMMENTS**” and inserting “**NEWS COMMENTARY**”; and

(B) by striking “**comments**” and inserting “**news commentary**”; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) **ALTERNATIVE PUBLICATION.**—In a continuity of operations event in which the Government Publishing Office does not fulfill the publication requirements of this chapter, the Office of the Federal Register may establish a website to publish the Federal Register until such time that the Government Publishing Office resumes publication.”; and

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, in the matter following paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “**telecommunications, the Internet,**” after “**the press, the radio,**”; and

(B) by striking “**and two duplicate originals or two certified copies**” and inserting “**document**”.

(f) **ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (a) of section 1506 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **COMPOSITION; DUTIES.**—The Administrative Committee of the Federal Register shall consist of the Archivist of the United States or Acting Archivist, who shall chair the committee, an officer of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, and the Director of the Government Publishing Office or Acting Director of the Government Publishing Office. The Director of the Federal Register shall act as secretary of the committee. The committee shall prescribe, with the approval of the President, regulations for carrying out this chapter. The regulations shall provide for, among other things—

“(1) the documents which shall be authorized under section 1505(b) to be published in the Federal Register;

“(2) the manner and form in which the Federal Register shall be published;

“(3) the manner and form in which agencies submit documents for publication in the Federal Register and special editions of the Federal Register;

“(4) subject to subsection (b), the manner of distribution to Members of Congress, officers and employees of the United States, or Federal agency, for official use, and the number which shall be available for distribution to the public;

“(5) the prices to be charged for individual copies of, and subscriptions to, the Federal Register and any reprints and bound volumes of it;

“(6) the manner and form by which the Federal Register may receive information and comments from the public, if practicable and efficient; and

“(7) special editions of the Federal Register.”.

(g) CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS AMENDMENT.—Section 1510 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1510. Code of Federal Regulations

“(a) SPECIAL EDITION FOR CODIFICATION OF AGENCY DOCUMENTS.—The Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, with the approval of the President, may require, from time to time as it considers necessary, the preparation and publication in a special edition of the Federal Register a complete codification of the documents of each agency of the Government having general applicability and legal effect, issued or promulgated by the agency by publication in the Federal Register or by filing with the Administrative Committee, and which are relied upon by the agency as authority for, or are invoked or used by it in the discharge of, its activities or functions, and are in effect as to facts arising on or after dates specified by the Administrative Committee.

“(b) CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.—A codification prepared under subsection (a) of this section shall be published and shall be designated as the ‘Code of Federal Regulations’. The Administrative Committee shall regulate the manner and forms of publishing this codification.

“(c) SUPPLEMENTATION, COLLATION, AND REPUBLICATION.—The Administrative Committee shall regulate the supplementation and the collation and republication of the codification with a view to keeping the Code of Federal Regulations as current as practicable. Each unit of codification shall be supplemented and republished at least once each calendar year. The Office of the Federal Register may create updates of each unit of codification from time to time and make the same available electronically or may provide public access using an electronic edition that allows a user to select a specific date and retrieve the version of the codification in effect as of that date.

“(d) PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION BY THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Office of the Federal Register shall prepare and publish the codifications, supplements, collations, indices, and user aids authorized by this section.

“(e) PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE.—The codified documents of the several agencies published in the Code of Federal Regulations under this section, as amended by documents subsequently filed with the Office and published in the daily issues of the Federal Register, shall be prima facie evidence of the text of the documents and of the fact that they are in effect on and after the date of publication.

“(f) REGULATIONS.—The Administrative Committee, with approval of the President, shall issue regulations for carrying out this section.

“(g) EXCEPTION.—This section does not require codification of the text of Presidential documents published and periodically compiled in supplements to title 3 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”.

(h) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for chapter 15 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the items related to sections 1502, 1503, and 1504 and inserting the following:

“1502. Custody and publishing of Federal documents; appointment of Director.

“1503. Filing documents with Office; notation of time; public inspection; transmission for publishing.

“1504. ‘Federal Register’; publishing; contents; distribution; price.”.

SA 2402. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. MERKLEY)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS DURING NOVEL CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC.

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

(1) the United States should lead the international community in its efforts to respond to the novel coronavirus pandemic;

(2) the United States, in implementing emergency policies at home and through its diplomacy and foreign assistance abroad, should promote the protection of internationally recognized human rights during and after the coronavirus pandemic;

(3) the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this section as “USAID”) should provide assistance and implement programs, directly or through nongovernmental organizations or international organizations, that—

(A) support democratic institutions, civil society, free media, and other internationally recognized human rights during, and in the aftermath of, the novel coronavirus pandemic; and

(B) ensure attention to countries in which the government’s response to the pandemic violated human rights and democratic norms; and

(4) in implementing emergency policies in response to the novel coronavirus pandemic—

(A) governments should fully respect and comply with internationally recognized human rights, including the rights to life, liberty, and security of the person, the freedoms of movement, religion, speech, peaceful assembly, association, freedom of expression and of the press, and the freedom from arbitrary detention, discrimination, or invasion of privacy;

(B) emergency restrictions or powers that impact internationally recognized human rights, including the rights to freedom of assembly, association, and movement should be—

(i) narrowly tailored, proportionate, and necessary to the government’s legitimate goal of ending the pandemic;

(ii) limited in duration;

(iii) clearly communicated to the population;

(iv) subject to independent government oversight; and

(v) implemented in a nondiscriminatory and fully transparent manner;

(C) governments—

(i) should not place any limits or other restrictions on, or criminalize, the free flow of information; and

(ii) should make all efforts to provide and maintain open access to the internet and other communications platforms;

(D) emergency measures should not discriminate against any segment of the population, including minorities, vulnerable individuals, and marginalized groups;

(E) monitoring systems put in place to track and reduce the impact of the novel coronavirus should, at a minimum—

(i) abide by privacy best practices involving data anonymization and aggregation;

(ii) be administered in an open and transparent manner;

(iii) be scientifically justified and necessary to limit the spread of disease;

(iv) be employed for a limited duration of time in correspondence with the system’s public health objective;

(v) be subject to independent oversight;

(vi) incorporate reasonable data security measures; and

(vii) be firewalled from other commercial and governmental uses, such as law enforcement and the enforcement of immigration policies; and

(F) governments should take every feasible measure to protect the administration of free and fair elections.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to encourage the protection and promotion of internationally recognized human rights at home and abroad at all times and especially during the novel coronavirus pandemic;

(2) to support freedom of expression and freedom of the press in the United States and elsewhere, which freedoms are critical to ensuring public dissemination of, and access to, accurate information about the novel coronavirus pandemic, including information authorities need to enact science-based policies that limit the spread and impact of the virus, while protecting human rights;

(3) to support multilateral efforts to address the novel coronavirus pandemic; and

(4) to oppose the use of the novel coronavirus pandemic as a justification for the enactment of laws and policies that use states of emergency to violate or otherwise restrict the human rights of citizens, inconsistent with the principles of limitation and derogation, and without clear scientific or public health justifications, including the coercive, arbitrary, disproportionate, or unlawful use of surveillance technology.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS.—The term “internationally recognized human rights” means—

(A) the human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including the rights to life, liberty, security of person, the freedom of movement, religion, speech, peaceful assembly, association, freedom of expression and the press, the freedom from arbitrary detention, discrimination, or invasion of privacy; and

(B) all other rights indispensable for human dignity.

(d) FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS AND COUNTRIES.—

(1) PROGRAM PRIORITIES.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (g) may be made available for fiscal years 2020 through 2025, to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act

of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), including programs to support democratic institutions, freedom of the press, civil society, and human rights defenders in countries where government measures taken in response to the novel coronavirus pandemic, including emergency measures, violated or seriously undermined internationally recognized human rights according to the principles set forth in subsection (a)(4). Programs carried out under this paragraph shall be designed—

(A) to strengthen and support all internationally recognized human rights, freedom of the press, human rights defenders, and civil society; and

(B) to restore and strengthen democratic institutions.

(2) STRATEGY.—

(A) INITIAL STRATEGY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Administrator of USAID shall jointly submit an initial strategy for carrying out the programs referred to in paragraph (1) to the appropriate congressional committees.

(B) STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Administrator of USAID shall submit a 5-year strategic plan to the appropriate congressional committees that lays out the steps the Department of State and USAID will take, through diplomacy and foreign assistance, to address the persistent issues related to internationally recognized human rights in the aftermath of the novel coronavirus response, including identifying the resources necessary to implement such strategic plan.

(3) CONDITIONING OF SECURITY SECTOR ASSISTANCE.—Section 502B(a)(4) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) has engaged in the systematic violation of internationally recognized human rights through the use of emergency laws, policies, or administrative procedures.”.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall publish on the Department of State website, and submit to the appropriate congressional committees, a report that describes—

(A) for each country and territory included in the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, whether and how each country or territory has adhered to the principles set forth in subsection (a)(4) in responding to the novel coronavirus pandemic;

(B) with regard to each country in which the response to the novel coronavirus pandemic violated or seriously undermined internationally recognized human rights in a manner inconsistent with the principles of limitation and derogation, a description of—

(i) the actions of the United States Government to address such restrictions through diplomacy and the use of foreign assistance; and

(ii) any efforts made by each country to respond to and resolve such human rights concerns;

(C) with regard to each country in which the response to the coronavirus pandemic violated or seriously undermined internationally recognized human rights, a description of the impact of noncompliant policies on—

(i) the population’s access to health care services;

(ii) the population’s access to services for survivors of violence and abuse;

(iii) women and ethnic, religious, sexual, and other minority, vulnerable, or marginalized populations; and

(iv) the government’s efforts and ability to control the pandemic;

(D) whether any foreign person or persons within a country have been determined to have committed gross violations of internationally recognized human rights during the novel coronavirus pandemic response, including any sanctions imposed on such persons in accordance with United States law;

(E) actions taken by the Global Engagement Center established under section 1287 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (22 U.S.C. 2656 note) to counter disinformation related to the novel coronavirus pandemic; and

(F) the United States Government’s efforts around the world—

(i) to counter disinformation related to the novel coronavirus pandemic; and

(ii) to disseminate accurate information about the pandemic.

(2) MONTHLY REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the publication of the report required under paragraph (1), and monthly thereafter until the date that is 60 days after the date on which the World Health Organization declares that the novel coronavirus pandemic has ended, the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development shall provide, to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) a briefing containing updates on any new developments related to issues covered in the report published under paragraph (1); and

(B) a list of the countries that have removed coronavirus-related emergency restrictions impacting internationally recognized human rights, including details regarding the restrictions that were removed.

(3) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the World Health Organization declares that the novel coronavirus pandemic has ended, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) lists the countries whose emergency measures or other legal actions limiting internationally recognized human rights in a manner inconsistent with the principles of limitation and derogation extended beyond the end of the pandemic;

(B) describes such countries’ emergency measures, including—

(i) how such procedures violate or seriously undermine internationally recognized human rights; and

(ii) an analysis of the impact of such measures on—

(I) the government’s efforts and ability to control the pandemic within the country;

(II) the population’s access to health care services;

(III) the population’s access to services for survivors of violence and abuse; and

(IV) women and ethnic, religious, sexual, and other minority, vulnerable, or marginalized populations;

(C) describes—

(i) any surveillance measures implemented or utilized by the governments of such countries as part of the novel coronavirus pandemic response;

(ii) the extent to which such measures have been, or have not been, rolled back; and

(iii) whether and how such measures impact internationally recognized human rights; and

(D) indicates whether any foreign person or persons within a country have been determined to have committed gross violations of internationally recognized human rights during the novel coronavirus pandemic response, including a description of any result-

ing sanctions imposed on such persons under United States law.

(f) COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 116(f)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(f)(1)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) A description of—

“(i) any misuse by the government of such country of any emergency powers;

“(ii) any failure by the government of such country—

“(I) to state the specific duration of the powers referred to in clause (i);

“(II) to clearly articulate the purposes of such powers; or

“(III) to notify the United Nations regarding the use of such powers, as required by applicable treaty;

“(iii) any failure by the government of such country—

“(I) to abide by the stated purposes of the powers referred to in clause (i); or

“(II) to cease the use of such powers after any specified term expires;

“(iv) any violations by the government of such country of non-derogable rights;

“(v) any discriminatory implementation by such government of the powers referred to in clause (i);

“(vi) the impact of such powers on the access of the people of such country to health care services; and

“(vii) the development and proliferation of surveillance technologies in such country, including new or emerging technologies used by the government of such country in the surveillance of civilian populations in ways that are inconsistent with the standards described in subsection (a)(4)(E) of the Protecting Human Rights During Pandemic Act.”.

(2) HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(b)) is amended by inserting “Each report under this section shall include the information described in section 116(f)(1)(C).” after “the Secretary of State.”.

(B) BRIEFING.—The Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor shall be available to brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives regarding the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices during the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the reports are released.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out—

(1) the strategy described in subsection (d)(2)(A);

(2) the 5-year strategic plan described in subsection (d)(2)(B); and

(3) the reporting requirements set forth in subsection (e).

SA 2403. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII, insert the following:

SEC. 2806. INCREASED AUTHORITY FOR LABORATORY REVITALIZATION PROJECTS.

Section 2805(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$6,000,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

SA 2404. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON REDUCTION IN GRADUATES FROM UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES.

The Secretary of Defense may not reduce the annual number of graduates from the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences from the number that graduated in 2019.

SA 2405. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IX, add the following:

Subtitle E—District of Columbia National Guard Home Rule**SEC. _____. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the “District of Columbia National Guard Home Rule Act”.

SEC. _____. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL GUARD AUTHORITIES TO MAYOR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) **MAYOR AS COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF.**—Section 6 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes”, approved March 1, 1889 (sec. 49–409, D.C. Official Code), is amended by striking “President of the United States” and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(b) **RESERVE CORPS.**—Section 72 of such Act (sec. 49–407, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “President of the United States” each place it appears and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(c) **APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.**—(1) Section 7(a) of such Act (sec. 49–301(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) by striking “President of the United States” and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”; and

(B) by striking “President.” and inserting “Mayor.”.

(2) Section 9 of such Act (sec. 49–304, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “President” and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(3) Section 13 of such Act (sec. 49–305, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “Presi-

dent of the United States” and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(4) Section 19 of such Act (sec. 49–311, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “to the Secretary of the Army” and all that follows through “which board” and inserting “to a board of examination appointed by the Commanding General, which”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “the Secretary of the Army” and all that follows through the period and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia, together with any recommendations of the Commanding General.”.

(5) Section 20 of such Act (sec. 49–312, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) by striking “President of the United States” each place it appears and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”; and

(B) by striking “the President may retire” and inserting “the Mayor may retire”.

(d) **CALL FOR DUTY.**—(1) Section 45 of such Act (sec. 49–103, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “, or for the United States Marshal” and all that follows through “shall thereupon order” and inserting “to order”.

(2) Section 46 of such Act (sec. 49–104, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “the President” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(e) **GENERAL COURTS MARTIAL.**—Section 51 of such Act (sec. 49–503, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “the President of the United States” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

SEC. _____. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) **FAILURE TO SATISFACTORILY PERFORM PRESCRIBED TRAINING.**—Section 10148(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(b) **APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF OF NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.**—Section 10502(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking “the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(c) **VICE CHIEF OF NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.**—Section 10505(a)(1)(A) of such title is amended by striking “the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(d) **OTHER SENIOR NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU OFFICERS.**—Section 10506(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking “the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” both places it appears and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(e) **CONSENT FOR ACTIVE DUTY OR RELOCATION.**—(1) Section 12301 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” in the second sentence and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, or, in the case of the District of Columbia National Guard, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.”.

(2) Section 12406 of such title is amended by striking “the commanding general of the National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(f) **CONSENT FOR RELOCATION OF UNITS.**—Section 18238 of such title is amended by striking “the commanding general of the National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

SEC. _____. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) **MAINTENANCE OF OTHER TROOPS.**—Section 109(c) of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking “(or commanding general in the case of the District of Columbia)”.

(b) **DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES.**—Section 112(h)(2) of such title is amended by striking “the Commanding General of the National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(c) **ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.**—Section 113 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **INCLUSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**—In this section, the term ‘State’ includes the District of Columbia.”.

(d) **APPOINTMENT OF ADJUTANT GENERAL.**—Section 314 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b);

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated), by striking “the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia.”.

(e) **RELIEF FROM NATIONAL GUARD DUTY.**—Section 325(a)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking “commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(f) **AUTHORITY TO ORDER TO PERFORM ACTIVE GUARD AND RESERVE DUTY.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (a) of section 328 of such title is amended by striking “the commanding general” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia after consultation with the commanding general”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **SECTION HEADING.**—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§328. Active Guard and Reserve duty: authority of chief executive”.

(B) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 328 and inserting the following new item:

“328. Active Guard and Reserve duty: authority of chief executive.”.

(g) **PERSONNEL MATTERS.**—Section 505 of such title is amended by striking “commanding general of the National Guard of the District of Columbia” in the first sentence and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(h) **NATIONAL GUARD CHALLENGE PROGRAM.**—Section 509 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard, under which the Governor or the commanding general” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia, under which the Governor or the Mayor”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(2), by striking “the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”;

(3) in subsection (j), by striking “the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”; and

(4) in subsection (k), by striking “the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “the Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(i) **ISSUANCE OF SUPPLIES.**—Section 702(a) of such title is amended by striking “commanding general of the National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

(j) **APPOINTMENT OF FISCAL OFFICER.**—Section 708(a) of such title is amended by striking “commanding general of the National

Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Mayor of the District of Columbia”.

SEC. ____ . CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE ACT.

Section 602(b) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1-206.02(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “the National Guard of the District of Columbia,”.

SA 2406. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . MANDATORY DISCLOSURE OF TRUMP ORGANIZATION FOREIGN PROPERTY INTERESTS.

(a) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(5) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(6) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(7) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(8) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(9) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 30 days thereafter while President Donald J. Trump remains in office, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) identifies all residential and commercial tenants leasing space in a foreign property owned or managed by the Trump Organization (including its subsidiaries), including beneficial ownership information and nationality for each tenant listed as a limited liability company;

(2) discloses, for each of the calendar years 2017, 2018, and 2019, the total income earned by the Trump Organization from any licensing agreements for foreign properties referred to in paragraph (1); and

(3) includes copies of all active licensing agreements signed by a representative of the Trump Organization for foreign properties referred to in paragraph (1).

SA 2407. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XVI, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE FUTURE COMMERCIAL SOURCES OF SATELLITE IMAGERY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) is moving forward with acquiring commercial satellite imagery following the end of the decade-long EnhancedView contract, set to end at the end of fiscal year 2020.

(2) The Director of the National Reconnaissance Office expects to continue a program of open competition likely leading to contracts with multiple awardees.

(3) The Office continues to be responsive to the requirements of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) and the broader Department of Defense geospatial-intelligence (GEOINT) user community, including the combatant commands (COCOMs), functional commands, and other key elements of the Armed Forces, including fulfilling the geospatial-intelligence requirements of the user community to the greatest extent.

(4) The Office is working proactively with industry to apply commercial solutions to known intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance gaps as much as possible.

(b) **BRIEFING REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a briefing on the plans of the Director to support the continuation of commercial data acquisitions.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The briefing required under subsection (b) shall cover the following:

(1) Identification of new commercial providers or new commercial data sets and solutions.

(2) Plans for transitioning providers from pilot programs to operational contracts.

(3) How user needs previously met by the EnhancedView contract will be met or exceeded by follow-on contracts.

(4) On-ramps for new capabilities responsive to additional user needs.

(d) **DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 2408. Ms. DUCKWORTH (for Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. DURBIN)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1216. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EFFORTS TO SECURE THE RELEASE OF ALL AMERICANS HELD HOSTAGE IN AFGHANISTAN OR PAKISTAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President and the Department of State should prioritize and continue efforts

to secure the release of all Americans held hostage by the Taliban, Haqqani Network, or any other group in Afghanistan or Pakistan; and

(2) the Office of the Special Presidential Envoy for Hostage Affairs should regularly brief Congress on its efforts.

SA 2409. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. 1224. ASSISTANCE TO THE PEOPLE OF SYRIA.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) As of November 14, 2019, according to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, more than 190,000 Syrian Kurdish civilians are internally displaced and more than 400,000 civilians in the Syrian conflict zone will have significant humanitarian needs in Kurdish-controlled areas of northeastern Syria as a result of ongoing Turkish operations against Syrian Democratic Forces.

(2) Members of the Syrian Democratic Forces have fought on the front lines against the Islamic State, in partnership and with the close support of the United States and its allies and partners.

(b) **HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that all parties to the conflict in Syria should uphold international humanitarian principles by facilitating and expanding humanitarian access across Syria and supporting the rapid, safe, and unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance to those in greatest need.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The President is authorized to provide assistance authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to carry out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), section 202 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1722), and subsections (a) through (c) of section 2 of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (22 U.S.C. 2601) to meet the urgent humanitarian needs of Syrian refugees and displaced persons, as well as communities hosting significant numbers of Syrian refugees and displaced persons, in accordance with established international humanitarian principles.

(c) **REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, INCLUDING WAR CRIMES, AND OTHER HARM TO CIVILIANS IN SYRIA DURING THE TURKISH INCURSION.**—

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

(A) Turkish and pro-Turkish forces should end all practices involving arbitrary arrests, enforced disappearances, torture, arbitrary executions, and other unlawful treatment; and

(B) all parties in the Turkish incursion should reveal the fate or the location of all persons who have been subjected to enforced disappearance.

(2) **REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall review evidence of these crimes committed by groups equipped and supported by Turkey, as authorized by the Syrian war crimes provision

in section 1232 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the causes and consequences of civilian harm occurring during the Turkish incursion into northeast Syria, including violations of the law of armed conflict, and gross violations of human rights as a result of the actions of all parties to the conflict.

(B) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall include the following elements:

(i) A description of civilian harm occurring in the context of the Turkish incursion, including—

- (I) mass casualty incidents; and
- (II) damage to, and destruction of, civilian infrastructure and services, including—
 - (aa) hospitals and other medical facilities;
 - (bb) electrical grids;
 - (cc) water systems; and
 - (dd) other critical infrastructure.

(ii) A description of violations of the law of armed conflict committed during the Turkish incursion into northeast Syria by Turkish or pro-Turkish forces, including—

(I) alleged war crimes, including the alleged use of chemical weapons against civilian targets;

(II) specific instances of failure by the parties to the conflict to exercise distinction, proportionality, and precaution in the use of force in accordance with the law of armed conflict;

(III) arbitrary denials of humanitarian access and the resulting impact on the alleviation of human suffering;

(IV) extra-judicial executions and detention-related abuses; and

(V) other acts that may constitute violations of the law of armed conflict.

(iii) Recommendations for establishing accountability mechanisms for civilian harm, war crimes, other violations of the law of armed conflict, and gross violations of human rights perpetrated by Turkish and pro-Turkish forces in northeast Syria, including the potential for prosecuting individuals perpetrating, organizing, directing, or ordering such violations.

(d) **UNITED STATES REFUGEE PROGRAM PRIORITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall designate, as Priority 2 refugees of special humanitarian concern—

(A) Syrian Kurds and other Syrians who were or are employed by the United States Government in Syria in support of the United States military or humanitarian mission in Syria, as determined by the Secretary of State, for an aggregate period of at least 1 year beginning on or after January 1, 2014;

(B) Syrian Kurds and other Syrians who establish, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State, that they are or were employed in Syria for an aggregate period of at least 1 year beginning on or after January 1, 2014, by—

- (i) a media or nongovernmental organization headquartered in the United States; or
- (ii) an organization or entity that—

(I) is closely associated with the United States military or humanitarian mission in Syria, as determined by the Secretary of State; and

(II) has received a grant from, or entered into a cooperative agreement or contract with, the United States Government;

(C) the spouses, children, and parents of aliens described in subparagraph (A); and

(D) Syrian Kurds and other Syrians who—

- (i) have been identified by the Secretary of State as a persecuted group; and
- (ii) have close family members (as described in section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) or 203(a) of

the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(b)(2)(A)(i) and 1153(a)) in the United States.

(2) **ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION AS A REFUGEE.**—An alien may not be denied the opportunity to apply for admission as a refugee under this subsection solely because such alien qualifies as an immediate relative of a national of the United States or is eligible for admission to the United States under any other immigrant classification.

(3) **MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN SYRIAN ORGANIZATIONS.**—An applicant for admission to the United States may not be deemed inadmissible based on membership in, or support provided to, the Syrian Democratic Forces.

(4) **IDENTIFICATION OF OTHER PERSECUTED GROUPS.**—The Secretary of State is authorized to classify other groups of Syrians, including vulnerable populations, as Priority 2 refugees of special humanitarian concern.

(e) **SPECIAL IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN SYRIAN KURDS AND OTHER SYRIANS WHO WORKED FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN SYRIA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (4)(A), for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), the Secretary of Homeland Security may provide any alien described in paragraph (2) with the status of a special immigrant under section 101(a)(27) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)) if—

(A) the alien, or an agent acting on behalf of the alien, submits a petition to the Secretary under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) for classification under section 203(b)(4) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(4));

(B) the alien is otherwise eligible to receive an immigrant visa;

(C) the alien is otherwise admissible to the United States for permanent residence (excluding the grounds for inadmissibility specified in section 212(a)(4) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4))); and

(D) clears a background check and appropriate screening, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(2) **ALIENS DESCRIBED.**—An alien described in this paragraph—

(A)(i) is a national of Syria or a stateless Kurd habitually residing in Syria;

(ii) was or is employed by, or on behalf of, the United States Government in a role that was vital to the success of the United States' Counter ISIS mission in Syria, as determined by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, for a period of at least 1 year beginning on January 1, 2014;

(iii) obtained a favorable written recommendation from the employee's senior supervisor (or the person currently occupying that position) or a more senior person, if the employee's senior supervisor has left the employer or has left Syria, in the entity that was supported by the alien;

(iv) cleared a background check and screening before submitting a petition under paragraph (1)(A), pursuant to the requirements set forth in paragraph (3)(C); and

(v) has experienced or is experiencing an ongoing serious threat as a consequence of the alien's employment by the United States Government; or

(B)(i) is the spouse or a child of a principal alien described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) is following or accompanying to join the principal alien in the United States.

(3) **EVALUATION OF PETITIONS.**—

(A) **DESIGNATION OF OFFICER.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall designate a senior foreign service officer to provide an evaluation of potential applicants before approving a petition under this subsection.

(B) **GUIDELINES.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall publish guidelines for evaluating petitions under this subsection.

(C) **APPROVAL PROCESS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), a petition may not be approved under this subsection unless the recommendation described in subparagraph (A)(iii) is approved by the designee referred to in subparagraph (A), after conducting a risk assessment of the alien petitioner and an independent review of relevant records maintained by the United States Government or hiring organization or entity to confirm that the alien was employed by, and provided faithful service to, the United States Government.

(ii) **NOTIFICATION AND APPEAL.**—An applicant whose application has been denied under clause (i)—

(I) shall receive a written decision that provides, to the maximum extent feasible, information describing the basis for the denial, including the facts and inferences underlying the individual determination; and

(II) shall be provided an opportunity for not more than 1 written appeal, which—

(aa) shall be submitted not more than 120 days after the date on which the applicant receives such written decision;

(bb) may request the reopening of such denial; and

(cc) shall provide additional information, clarify existing information, or explain any unfavorable information.

(D) **EVIDENCE OF SERIOUS THREAT.**—In making a determination under paragraph (2)(A)(v), a credible sworn statement depicting dangerous country conditions and official evidence of such country conditions from the United States Government shall be considered as a factor in determining whether an alien petitioner has experienced or is experiencing an ongoing serious threat as a consequence of the alien's employment by the United States Government.

(4) **NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided under this paragraph, the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this subsection may not exceed 400 in any fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) **EXCLUSION FROM NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.**—Aliens provided special immigrant status under this subsection shall not be counted against any numerical limitation under section 201(d), 202(a), or 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(d), 1152(a), and 1153(b)(4)).

(C) **CARRY FORWARD.**—If the numerical limitation set forth in subparagraph (A) is not reached during a fiscal year, the numerical limitation under such subparagraph for the following fiscal year shall be increased by a number equal to the difference between—

(i) the number of visas authorized under subparagraph (A) for such fiscal year; and

(ii) the number of principal aliens provided special immigrant status under this subsection during such fiscal year.

(5) **VISA AND PASSPORT ISSUANCE AND FEES.**—An alien described in paragraph (2) may not be charged any fee in connection with an application for, or the issuance of, a special immigrant visa under this subsection.

(6) **PROTECTION OF ALIENS.**—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, shall make a reasonable effort to provide protection to each alien described in paragraph (2) who is seeking special immigrant status under this subsection or to immediately remove such alien from Syria, if possible, if

the Secretary determines, after consultation, that such alien is in imminent danger.

(7) **SECURITY.**—An alien is not eligible for admission as a special immigrant under this subsection if the alien is otherwise inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)).

(8) **APPLICATION PROCESS.**—

(A) **REPRESENTATION.**—An alien applying for admission to the United States as a special immigrant under this subsection may be represented during the application process, including at relevant interviews and examinations, by an attorney or other accredited representative. Such representation shall not be at the expense of the United States Government.

(B) **COMPLETION.**—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall ensure that applications for special immigrant visas under this subsection are processed in such a manner to ensure that all steps under the control of the respective departments incidental to the issuance of such visas, including required screenings and background checks, are completed not later than 9 months after the date on which an eligible alien submits all required materials to apply for such visa.

(C) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), any Secretary referred to in such paragraph may take longer than 9 months to complete the steps incidental to issuing a visa under this section if the Secretary—

(i) determines that the satisfaction of national security concerns requires additional time; and

(ii) notifies the applicant of such determination.

(9) **ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER IMMIGRANT CLASSIFICATION.**—An alien may not be denied the opportunity to apply for admission under this subsection solely because such alien—

(A) qualifies as an immediate relative of a national of the United States; or

(B) is eligible for admission to the United States under any other immigrant classification.

(10) **RESETTLEMENT SUPPORT.**—An alien who is granted special immigrant status under this subsection shall be eligible for the same resettlement assistance, entitlement programs, and other benefits as are available to refugees admitted under section 207 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (8 U.S.C. 1157).

(11) **AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense shall implement any additional administrative measures they consider necessary and appropriate—

(A) to ensure the prompt processing of applications under this subsection;

(B) to preserve the integrity of the program established under this subsection; and

(C) to protect the national security interests of the United States related to such program.

(12) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security under section 1059 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 8 U.S.C. 1101 note).

(f) **PROCESSING MECHANISMS.**—The Secretary of State shall use existing refugee processing mechanisms in Iraq and in other countries in the region, as appropriate, through which—

(1) aliens described in subsection (d)(1) may apply and interview for admission to the United States as refugees; and

(2) aliens described in subsection (e)(2) may apply and interview for admission to the United States as special immigrants.

SA 2410. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 156. REPORT ON LC-130 AIRCRAFT INVENTORY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing future Department of Defense plans for modernizing and sustaining the LC-130 aircraft in its inventory.

SA 2411. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1052. ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS ON THE TRANSFER OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROPERTY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) **ADDITIONAL TRAINING OF RECIPIENT AGENCY PERSONNEL REQUIRED.**—Subsection (b)(6) of section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including respect for the rights of citizens under the Constitution of the United States and de-escalation of force”.

(b) **CERTAIN PROPERTY NOT TRANSFERRABLE.**—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

“(d) **PROPERTY NOT TRANSFERRABLE.**—The Secretary may not transfer to a Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency under this section the following:

“(1) Bayonets.

“(2) Grenades (other than stun and flash-bang grenades).

“(3) Weaponized tracked combat vehicles.

“(4) Weaponized drones.”.

SA 2412. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal

year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 752. REPORT ON MEDICAL CAPACITY SUPPORT BY UNITED STATES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES RECEIVING UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on activities by the United States to support the medical capacity of foreign countries receiving assistance from the United States.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of programs and activities by the United States that support medical corps capacity building among foreign countries receiving security assistance from the United States, including—

(A) a list of countries that have received support through such programs and activities during the two-year period preceding the submittal of the report; and

(B) a description of the support provided to each recipient.

(2) An assessment of whether programs and activities currently authorized to support medical corps capacity building among foreign countries receiving assistance from the United States are sufficient—

(A) to ensure functioning combat casualty care treatment and equipment that meets or exceeds the standards recommended by the Committee on Tactical Combat Casualty Care; and

(B) to care for the wounded and sick in line with obligations under the law of armed conflict.

(3) An assessment of the efficacy of programs of the United States to support the medical capacity of foreign countries receiving assistance from the United States, and any recommendations of the Secretary of Defense on whether further authorities or resources are needed to meet the standards described in paragraph (2)(A).

(4) A summary assessment of the capacity and key gaps within the military medical corps of Afghanistan and Iraq, with a focus on their ability to provide battlefield medical care to soldiers and wounded civilians in line with obligations under the law of armed conflict.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified but may include a classified annex.

SA 2413. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. PILOT PROGRAM ON DOULA SUPPORT FOR VETERANS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) There are approximately 2,300,000 women within the veteran population in the United States.

(2) The number of women veterans using services from the Veterans Health Administration has increased by 28.8 percent from 423,642 in 2014 to 545,670 in 2019.

(3) During the period of 2010 through 2015, the use of maternity services from the Veterans Health Administration increased by 44 percent.

(4) Although prenatal care and delivery is not provided in facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, pregnant women seek care from the Department for other conditions may also need emergency care and require coordination of services through the Veterans Community Care Program under section 1703 of title 38, United States Code.

(5) The number of unique women veteran patients with an obstetric delivery paid for by the Department increased by 1,778 percent from 200 deliveries in 2000 to 3,756 deliveries in 2015.

(6) The number of women age 35 years or older with an obstetric delivery paid for by the Department increased 16-fold from fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2015.

(7) A study in 2010 found that veterans returning from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom who experienced pregnancy were twice as likely to have a diagnosis of depression, anxiety, posttraumatic stress disorder, bipolar disorder, or schizophrenia as those who had not experienced a pregnancy.

(8) The number of women veterans of reproductive age seeking care from the Veterans Health Administration continues to grow (more than 185,000 as of fiscal year 2015).

(b) PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a pilot program to furnish doula services to covered veterans through eligible entities by expanding the Whole Health model of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or successor model, to measure the impact that doula support services have on birth and mental health outcomes of pregnant veterans (in this section referred to as the “pilot program”).

(2) CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary shall consider all types of doulas, including traditional and community-based doulas.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In designing and implementing the pilot program the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including—

(A) organizations representing veterans, including veterans that are disproportionately impacted by poor maternal health outcomes;

(B) community-based health care professionals, including doulas, and other stakeholders; and

(C) experts in promoting health equity and combating racial bias in health care settings.

(4) GOALS.—The goals of the pilot program are the following:

(A) To improve—

(i) maternal, mental health, and infant care outcomes;

(ii) integration of doula support services into the Whole Health model of the Department, or successor model; and

(iii) the experience of women receiving maternity care from the Department, including by increasing the ability of a woman to develop and follow her own birthing plan.

(B) To reengage veterans with the Department after giving birth.

(c) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program in—

(1) the three Veterans Integrated Service Networks of the Department that have the highest percentage of female veterans enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department established and operated under section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, compared to the total number of enrolled veterans in such Network; and

(2) the three Veterans Integrated Service Networks that have the lowest percentage of female veterans enrolled in the patient enrollment system compared to the total number of enrolled veterans in such Network.

(d) OPEN PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary shall allow any eligible entity or covered veteran interested in participating in the pilot program to participate in the pilot program.

(e) SERVICES PROVIDED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under the pilot program, a covered veteran shall receive not more than 10 sessions of care from a doula under the Whole Health model of the Department, or successor model, under which a doula works as an advocate for the veteran alongside the medical team for the veteran.

(2) SESSIONS.—Sessions covered under paragraph (1) shall be as follows:

(A) Three or four sessions before labor and delivery.

(B) One session during labor and delivery.

(C) Three or four sessions after postpartum, which may be conducted via the mobile application for VA Video Connect.

(f) ADMINISTRATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Center for Women Veterans under section 318 of title 38, United States Code, in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Women Veterans established under section 542 of such title (in this section referred to as the “Advisory Committee”), shall—

(A) coordinate services and activities under the pilot program;

(B) oversee the administration of the pilot program; and

(C) conduct onsite assessments of medical facilities of the Department that are participating in the pilot program.

(2) GUIDELINES FOR VETERAN-SPECIFIC CARE.—The Center for Women Veterans, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, shall establish guidelines under the pilot program for training doulas on military sexual trauma and post traumatic stress disorder.

(3) AMOUNTS FOR CARE.—The Advisory Committee may recommend to the Secretary appropriate payment amounts for care and services provided under the pilot program, which shall not exceed \$3,500 per doula per veteran.

(4) INCLUSION OF OTHER MEMBERS IN ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Only for purposes of carrying out the duties of the Advisory Committee under this section, the Secretary shall appoint to the Advisory Committee representatives of organizations that provide doula services, including representatives that can speak to the unique challenges endured by veterans of color.

(g) DOULA SERVICE COORDINATOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Center for Women Veterans and the Advisory Committee, shall establish a Doula Service Coordinator within the functions of the Maternity Care Coordinator at each medical facility of the Department that is participating in the pilot program.

(2) DUTIES.—A Doula Service Coordinator established under paragraph (1) at a medical facility shall be responsible for—

(A) working with eligible entities, doulas, and covered veterans participating in the pilot program; and

(B) managing payment between eligible entities and the Department under the pilot program.

(3) TRACKING OF INFORMATION.—A doula providing services under the pilot program shall report to the applicable Doula Service Coordinator after each session conducted under the pilot program.

(4) COORDINATION WITH WOMEN'S PROGRAM MANAGER.—A Doula Service Coordinator for

a medical facility of the Department shall coordinate with the women's program manager for that facility in carrying out the duties of the Doula Service Coordinator under the pilot program.

(h) TERM OF PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall conduct the pilot program for a period of 5 years.

(i) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall establish a process to provide technical assistance to eligible entities and doulas participating in the pilot program.

(j) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for each year in which the pilot program is carried out, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—As part of the final report submitted under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include recommendations on whether the model studied in the pilot program should be continued or more widely adopted by the Department.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2026, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(l) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED VETERAN.—The term “covered veteran” means a pregnant veteran or a formerly pregnant veteran (with respect to sessions post-partum) who is enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means an entity that provides medically accurate, comprehensive maternity services to covered veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary, including under the Veterans Community Care Program under section 1703 of title 38, United States Code.

(3) VA VIDEO CONNECT.—The term “VA Video Connect” means the program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to connect veterans with their health care team from anywhere, using encryption to ensure a secure and private session.

SA 2414. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 549. INITIATIVES TO INCREASE DIVERSITY IN THE OFFICER CORPS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REPORT ON INITIATIVES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) A comprehensive description and assessment of the initiatives currently being undertaken by the military service academies to increase diversity among the officers corps of the Armed Forces.

(2) A description and assessment of the efforts undertaken by Diversity and Recruitment Officers of each military service academy to recruit in secondary schools to which

title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 applies.

(b) **RELEASE OF INFORMATION ON APPLICANTS AND ANNUAL CLASSES.**—The Superintendent of each military service academy shall adopt the approach taken by the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy in releasing to the congressional defense committees in a public manner the following:

(1) The manner in which each annual class of cadets or midshipmen is scored for admission.

(2) The racial and ethnic makeup of each annual class of cadets or midshipmen.

(c) **MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “military service academy” means the following:

- (1) The United States Military Academy.
- (2) The United States Naval Academy.
- (3) The United States Air Force Academy.
- (4) The United States Coast Guard Academy.

SA 2415. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 377 and insert the following:

SEC. 377. REMOVAL OF CONFEDERATE NAMES, SYMBOLS, DISPLAYS, MONUMENTS, AND PARAPHERNALIA FROM ASSETS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **REMOVAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall remove all names, symbols, displays, monuments, and paraphernalia that honor or commemorate the Confederate States of America (commonly referred to as the “Confederacy”) or any person who served voluntarily with the Confederate States of America from all assets of the Department of Defense.

(2) **EXEMPTION FOR GRAVE MARKERS.**—The requirement under paragraph (1) shall not apply to grave markers.

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—Upon completion of the removal required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a certification in writing detailing that such removal has been completed.

(c) **PROHIBITION ON DISPLAY.**—Beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits the certification required by subsection (b), the Secretary may not place, assign, or otherwise use any name, symbol, display, monument, or paraphernalia that honors or commemorates the Confederate States of America or any person who served voluntarily with the Confederate States of America at any asset of the Department.

(d) **ASSET DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “asset” includes any base, installation, street, building, facility, aircraft, ship, plane, weapon, equipment, or any other property owned or controlled by the Department of Defense.

SA 2416. Ms. WARREN (for Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations

for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1216. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EFFORTS TO SECURE THE RELEASE OF ALL AMERICANS HELD HOSTAGE IN AFGHANISTAN OR PAKISTAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President and the Department of State should prioritize and continue efforts to secure the release of all Americans held hostage by the Taliban, Haqqani Network, or any other group in Afghanistan or Pakistan; and

(2) the Office of the Special Presidential Envoy for Hostage Affairs should regularly brief Congress on its efforts.

SA 2417. Ms. CANTWELL (for Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1028, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 1029, line 8, and insert the following:

“(3) **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RESPONSE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Council submits to the Secretary of Energy a written description under paragraph (2)(B)(i) with respect to the budget request of the Administration for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall include as an appendix to the budget request submitted to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget—

“(i) the funding levels and initiatives identified in the description under paragraph (2)(B)(i); and

“(ii) any additional comments the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(B) **TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary of Energy shall transmit to Congress, with the budget justification materials submitted in support of the Department of Energy budget for a fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code), a copy of the appendix described in subparagraph (A).”

SA 2418. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1602.

SA 2419. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr.

INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1003. INCENTIVES FOR THE ACHIEVEMENT BY THE COMPONENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF UNQUALIFIED AUDIT OPINIONS ON THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

(a) **INCENTIVES REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall, acting through the Deputy Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Defense, develop and issue guidance to incentivize the achievement by each department, agency, and other component of the Department of Defense of unqualified audit opinions on their financial statements.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a description and assessment of current and proposed incentives for the achievement of unqualified audit opinions as described in subsection (a).

(c) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have 7 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 Wednesday, July 1, 2020, at 10:30 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 Wednesday, July 1, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 1, 2020, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet

during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 1, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 1, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 1, 2020, at 3 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 Wednesday, July 1, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the intern Sean Piwowar be allowed access to the floor for today.

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

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2020 second quarter Mass Mailing report is Monday, July 27, 2020. An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable PDF document. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically at http://webster.senate.gov/secretary/mass_mailing_form.htm or e-mailed to OPR_MassMailings@sec.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224-0322.

EXTENDING THE CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4148, introduced earlier day.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4148) to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 4148) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 4148

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-254; 6 U.S.C. 621 note) is amended by striking "July 23, 2020" and inserting "July 27, 2023".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 629.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 629) designating June 2020 as "Great Outdoors Month".

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 629) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 18, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to S. Res. 634.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 634) designating July 30, 2020, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day".

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 634) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 22, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 2, 2020

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 2; further, that following the prayer and the 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 following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of Calendar No. 718; finally, that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Vought nomination occur at 1:30 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:46 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 2, 2020, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be general

LT. GEN. GLEN D. VANHERCK

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

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JEFFREY A. KRUSE

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

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. RICHARD M. CLARK

IN THE ARMY

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

To be general

LT. GEN. CHRISTOPHER G. CAVOLI

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

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. SCOTT D. BERRIER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN

THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN C. ANDONIE
BRIG. GEN. CHARLES K. ARIS
BRIG. GEN. MARTT J. BISSELL
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT D. BURKE
BRIG. GEN. EDWARD J. CHRYSSTAL, JR.
BRIG. GEN. DAMIAN T. DONAHOE
BRIG. GEN. RALPH F. HEDENBERG
BRIG. GEN. JOHN E. HOEFERT
BRIG. GEN. RUSSELL D. JOHNSON
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY A. JONES
BRIG. GEN. JOHN T. KELLY
BRIG. GEN. ERIC K. LITTLE
BRIG. GEN. JERRY H. MARTIN
BRIG. GEN. JOANE K. MATHEWS
BRIG. GEN. MARK D. MCCORMACK
BRIG. GEN. REGINALD G. A. NEAL
BRIG. GEN. SHAWN M. O'BRIEN
BRIG. GEN. DAVID F. O'DONAHUE
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN B. OWENS
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN M. RADULSKI
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. RHODES
BRIG. GEN. FRANK M. RICE
BRIG. GEN. JAMES W. RING
BRIG. GEN. MICHELLE M. ROSE
BRIG. GEN. JOHN W. RUEGER
BRIG. GEN. RANDALL V. SIMMONS, JR.
BRIG. GEN. CARLTON G. SMITH
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN E. STIVERS
BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY N. STOMBLESON
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY P. VAN
BRIG. GEN. CLINT E. WALKER
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL D. WICKMAN
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM L. ZANA

IN THE NAVY

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TRENT R. DEMOSS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

JENNIFER M. KOLLMAR

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

SORAYA GODDARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

DAVID A. A. AWANDA

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

ANDREW S. LOHRENZ

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

To be lieutenant colonel

STEVEN J. ACKERSON
ANDREA ACOSTAMORALES
AARON E. ADAMS
BRUCE D. ADAMS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER C. ADKINS
JOSHUA J. AESCHLIMAN
DAVID J. AHERN
CHAD T. ALEXANDER
SETH M. ALLEN
BLAKELY M. ANDERSON
BRYAN K. ANDERSON
GLENN O. ANDERSON
KYLE W. ANDERSON
MICHAEL D. ANDERSON
THOMAS D. ANGSTADT
PETER A. ANZOVINO
JONATHAN B. ARMSTRONG
JAMES B. ASHTON
MARK B. ATKINSON
JOHN D. ATWELL
DEREK C. AUSTIN
ANNETTE N. BACALJA
WILLIAM C. BAKER
MATTHEW W. BANDI
GARRETT A. BARR
SETH E. BARRETT
CORBETT W. BAXTER
REBECCA E. BEARD
IAN H. BENSON
ANDREW P. BETSON
TIMOTHY P. BIART
NICOLAI BIRCH

DANIEL B. BLANKENHORN
EDWIN H. BODENHEIM
JOSEPH W. BORG
JOSHUA P. BOST
RACHEL R. BOWERS
BRETT M. BOYLE
TODD F. BRADFORD
JOSEPH W. BRADSHAW
ZACHARY D. BRAINARD
NATHAN A. BRANEN
ERIN E. BRASWELL
OBADIAH H. BRIANS
BENJAMIN A. BRIDON
DAVID T. BRIGHT
NATHAN E. BROOKSHIRE
GREGORY S. BROWER
JASON C. BRUBAKER
CRAIG W. BRYANT
CARMEN T. BUCCI
BRADFORD K. BUGADO
ANDY BUISSEERETH
JAMES M. BURNETT
SEAN C. BURNETT
DAVID T. BURTON
TIMOTHY A. BUTLER
DANIEL P. CAFFAREL
RYAN A. CALHOON
MICHAEL T. CAMPBELL
RICHARD C. CAMPBELL
TALGIN L. CANNON
JAMES P. CARRIER
BRENT C. CARTER
RYAN M. CASE
SEAN M. CASTILLA
PAUL M. CASTILLO
SEAN C. CHANG
STUART C. CHAPMAN
MATTHEW S. CHASE
TRINIDAD N. CHAVEZ
DAVID M. CHICHETTI
AARON W. CHN JEK
ASHLIE I. CHRISTIAN
MARK S. CHRISTIANSEN
JUSTIN C. CHRONISTER
JAMES A. CLARK
JOHN C. CLARK
CORY R. CLAYTON
DAVID M. COCHRANE
LOGAN P. COLLINS
CHRISTOPHER T. COLMAN
JAMES B. COMPTON
ERIAN E. CONNOLLY, JR.
GENNELLE L. CONWAY
BRIAN S. COOK
CHAVESO L. COOK
ALEXANDER B. CORBY
CHRISTOPHER M. COUCH
DAVID P. COULOMBE
DAVID B. COX
ORLANDO N. CRAIG
PETER S. CROSTHWAITE
STEVEN E. CROWE
BENJAMIN D. CULVER
PATRICK T. CUNNINGHAM
ZACHARY L. DADISMAH
MICHAEL J. DARGAVELL
DAMOND C. DAVIS
ALEXANDER R. DEAN
COURTNEY J. DEAN
JOHN B. DELOACH
JOHN W. DENNEY III
MICHAEL J. DIFABIO
SHAWN D. DILLON
ERIAN C. DODD
JONATHAN E. DOIRON
SCOTT J. DOLNY
ANDREW K. DOUGLASS
JASON P. DUFFY
JOSEPH J. DUMAS
CHRISTOPHER C. DUNCAN
STEPHEN J. DUNSFORD
BRIAN J. DYER
TRAVIS J. EASTERLING
BRIAN T. EDWARDS
JONATHAN C. EDWARDS
RYAN L. EDWARDS
YOLANDA M. EDWARDS
BURTON D. EISSLER
KYLE T. ELDRIDGE
THOMAS J. ELISON II
ERIC E. ELLIOTT
SCOTT T. ELLIOTT
TYLER J. ESPINOZA
ERIC G. EVANS
THOMAS B. EVERETT
RICHARD L. FARNELL
BENJAMIN D. FEICHT
DANIEL M. FERGUSON
RICHARD M. FERRELL
JAMES R. FISCHER
CHAD W. FITZGERALD
JEFFREY P. FLEMING
JEREMY L. FLOER
RICHARD T. FLOER
ALEXANDER S. FORD
RODERICK J. FORMAN
JONATHAN A. FORNES
CHERI J. FORSMAN
ADRIAN L. FOSTER
DANIEL J. FOX
MATTHEW W. FREEBURG
MICHAEL R. GABRHEL
SCOTT D. GALE
DONALD F. GALSTER
SAMUEL B. GALYK
RONALD L. GARBERSON
BERNARD R. GARDNER

KRISTOPHER J. GARDNER
THOMAS R. GEISINGER
GRAHAM C. GENRICH
CHRISTOPHER E. GEORGE
CHRISTOPHER R. GHOEBANI
BENJAMIN J. GILLESPIE
MARK D. GILLMAN
RYAN S. GLADDING
BRIAN K. GLENN
WILLIAM J. GOLEMBIEWSKI
BRENNAN S. GOLTRY
DANIEL R. GRAW
NELSON B. GRAY
DESHANE P. GREASER
COLIN J. GREATA
TIMOTHY N. GREEN
ADAM K. GREENE
BYRON N. GREENE
RYAN GREENING
CHRISTINA L. GRIGGS
SIMON P. GRIMM
JONATHAN J. GROSS
NICOLAS A. GUILLET
LOUISPHILIPPE L. HAMMOND
STEVEN T. HAMPSON
DAVID R. HAMPTON III
PAUL E. HANEY
JERRE V. HANSBROUGH
KARL M. HARNESS
WILLIE HARRIS III
SCOTT A. HASTINGS
BRANDON J. HATHORNE
MICHAEL E. HAVY, JR.
JONATHAN L. HAWKINS
MARK P. HAYES
SAMUEL L. HAYES, JR.
CHRISTOPHER A. HAYNES
JANELLE M. HAYNES
JOSHUA C. HAYWARD
MICHAEL G. HAZELL
JOHN J. HEIDENREICH
DEBORAH R. HERZOG
MARCEL M. HICKMAN
SEAN R. HILL
JOHANN W. HINDERT
TIMOTHY R. HINES
JONATHAN P. HITCHCOCK
SEAN P. HOEY
ERIKA A. HOLOWNIA
CALVIN R. HOOVER, JR.
TIMOTHY J. HORN
CHRISTOPHER P. HORNSBY
ISAAC S. HOWARD
LEVITICUS M. HUFF
ALBERT J. HUGHES
JACOB A. HUGHES
KEVIN D. HUMPHRES
ADRIEN G. HUMPHREYS
AUDREY D. HURDLE
DANIEL A. HUSEK
SUZANNA HUTIN
ALKA K. ICHINOSE
DAVID M. IKE
TODD L. IMPERIALE
JOHN C. INTILE
JAY A. IRELAND
SHAUN F. JACKSON
LATOYA J. JACKSONMANZEY
ANTHONY JAMES
STEFFANIE M. JEBB
RONALD A. JILLARD
LEE M. JOHNSON, JR.
ANDREW G. JONES
BRAD C. JORDAN
ERIK K. JORGENSEN
DAIJIRO KANASE
OLIVER N. KARP
BENJAMIN A. KATZENBERGER
ROBERT A. KAZMAREK
AARON L. KEARNEY
APRIL D. KEARNEY
MOLLIE G. KEDNEY
JAMIE L. KELLEY
RYAN V. KELLY
MICHAEL R. KELVINGTON
JULLIAN T. KEMPER
MICHAEL P. KENDALL
LUCAS J. KENNEDY
KRISTOPHER W. KERKSICK
MATTHEW J. KIKTA
COURTNEY L. KILUK
MICHAEL B. KIM
DAVID B. KIMSEY
MIKOLA J. KING
KYLE L. KIRKPATRICK
JASON S. KITTLESEN
DAVID M. KITZMAN
CHRISTOPHER E. KLICH
ROBERT C. KNAGGS
KURT S. KNOEDLER
ELIZABETH A. KNOX
KENTON C. KOMIVES
JASON D. KOO
RYAN R. KROELLS
COLBY K. KRUG
CHRISTOPHER P. KUSZNIJ
JOSEPH M. LANE
CALEB G. LAUE
RYAN M. LAUGHNA
DANIEL M. LAVOIE
JEREMY D. LAWHORN
LUCAS N. LECOUR
CHAD P. LEWIS
MARK A. LICHAK
JOSEPH A. LOAR
PAUL G. LOCKHART
CHRISTOPHER M. LOFTON

JOSHUA A. LONG
DUSTIN L. LONGFELLOW
VAL H. LOPEZ
DENNIS A. LOUCK
JACK H. LUCKHARDT
WILLIAM L. LYCKMAN
GEOFFREY B. LYNCH III
CHRISTOPHER L. LYON
MARGARET S. MAASBERG
JULIE A. MACKNYGHT
ULYSSES U. MAFNAS
BENJAMIN MAHER
BRIAN E. MAJOR
JUSTIN D. MALONE
JOSHUA J. MANGAS
AUSTIN P. MAPLES
LUIS D. MARIN
TODD J. MARTIN
GUILLERMO E. MARTINEZ
JASON MARTINEZ
ANDREW J. MAXA
ADAM F. MCCOMBS
BRIAN M. MCCRAY
ROBERT D. MCDONOUGH
MARY E. MCGOVNEY
TYLER S. MCKEE
DANIEL C. MCKEEL
JOHN M. MCLAUGHLIN
RYAN A. MCLAUGHLIN
JOHN M. MCLEAN II
PAUL M. MCNAMARA
OTTY H. MEDINA
JASON A. MEIER
PAUL J. MENDOZA
CHRISTOPHER L. MERCADO
MATTHEW J. MESKO
DANIELLE MILLIEN
BRIAN D. MITCHELL
TIMOTHY M. MITROKA
WESLEY A. MOERBE
CHAD A. MONROE
LEE D. MONZON
KENNETH E. MORAN
RYAN L. MORGAN
SHIGENOBU T. MORINAGA
STEPHEN M. MORSE
PAUL B. MORTON
JILL K. MUDGE
WILLIAM C. MURRAY
DANIEL S. NAAB
JAMIE O. NASI
PAUL E. NEAL
IRVIN NELMS III
SCOTT P. NELSON
JAMES M. NEMEC
ALEX L. NEWSOM
JOHN D. NGUYEN
KEN NGUYEN
JOY F. NICKEL
JUAN NIEVESLOZADA
CHRISTOPHER J. NOHLE
EDWARD J. NOVAKOSKI
RYAN R. NUGENT
DEREK L. OBERG
COLLEEN K. OBRIEN
RYAN J. OCCHIUZZO
EDWARD M. OCONNELL
PATRICK R. OCONNOR
TREVOR P. OMALLEY
RUBEN A. OTERO
TERRENCE J. OWENS
JAMES B. PACHECO
BRENT J. PAFFORD
MATTHEW N. PALADINO
JAROD V. PARKER
JOSHUA A. PARKER
MITCHELL A. PAYNE
STEVEN F. PAYNE
RICHARD B. PEACOCK
MICHAEL A. PEARCE
MARK C. PEER
MARCUS A. PEREZ
MARIAH J. PEREZ
JAMES E. PERKINS
LORI L. PERKINS
JOHN A. PETERSON
JONATHAN G. PETERSON
JOHN F. PETKOVICH III
CHRISTOPHER R. PEVEY
JONATHAN E. PFENDER
STEVEN E. PIERCE
COLE C. PINHEIRO
MATTHEW J. PIOSA
FRENCH D. POPE
MICHAEL A. PORGES
DAVID T. POWELL
JARED L. POWELL
JOSEPH R. POWER
MICHAEL J. PREDNY
JOHN C. PRINCIPE
JOSEPH M. QUINN
STEPHANIE M. RADFORD
DARIUS C. RANDOLPH
JAMES M. RAY
DEREK J. RAYMOND
TERRY F. REDD
GILBERT REDFORD
JEFFREY C. REED
MARK A. REID
MICHAEL J. REPASKY
BRIAN D. REYNOLDS
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
MATTHEW J. RIPKA
BENJAMIN D. ROARK
CHRISTOPHER B. ROBERTS
GEMA ROBLES
DREW G. RODGERS

JOHN P. ROMITO
DAVID B. ROUSSEAU
LAWRENCE A. RUBAL
ANDREW J. RUSZKIEWICZ
KEVIN E. RYAN
MICHAEL J. RYBACKI
CAMERON J. RYU
PETER S. SALFEETY
RAUL SALINAS
RAISSA O. SANCHEZ
JOSEPH M. SAWRUK
J. B. SAWYER
ADAM A. SCHER
LAWRENCE A. SCHMIDLE
ROBERT C. SCHUETTE
ADAM T. SCHULTZ
CHARLES B. SCHUMACHER
DAVID SEMIDEY
STEVEN P. SEVIGNY
KATHRYN L. SHAW
LAUREN M. SHAW
PAUL R. SHEPARD
MATTHEW J. SHIRLEY
GEOFFREY M. SHORR
ROBERT I. SICKLER
JAMES R. SIEBERT
DAVID J. SIMMONS
EMMANUEL I. SIOSON
AMANDA L. SLUGA
ANDREW L. SMITH
BRADLEY W. SMITH
KEVIN E. SMITH
MICAH S. SMITH
SEAN T. SMITH
PATRICK J. SNYDER
ANTON V. SOLTIS
BRANDON R. SOLTZWISCH
KYLE M. SPADE
MARTIN J. SPANGLER
BENJAMIN C. SPERA
THOMAS J. SPOLIZINO
SEAN R. STAPLER
RAYMOND L. STELKER
TODD J. STEVENSON
RYAN T. STIDUM
JACQUELINE K. STILWELL
ANDREW B. STIPP
THOMAS R. STOCKTON
NATHAN L. STRICKLAND
DONALD J. SULPIZIO
JARED J. SUNSDAHL
JOSHUA T. SUTHOFF
JACOB J. SWEATLAND
MICHAEL J. SVERTSEN
PAUL F. TANGHE
ROBERT A. TARR
FORREST M. TAYLOR
PATRICK B. TAYLOR
TRAVIS J. TAYLOR
MATTHEW S. TERRY
TIA M. TERRY
SEAN D. TINKLENBERG
MICHAEL Z. TIONGCO
ADAM R. TOBIAS
STEPHEN A. TOLBERT III
FRANK I. TOOMEY
DAMON M. TORRES
JOHN R. TRAHAN
JAMES D. TRASK
PO C. TSUI
JOSEPH A. TULL
GARRETT P. TURLEY
JASON E. TURNER
MICHAEL J. URSO
JEFFREY M. VANDYKE
MATTHEW B. VANPUTTE
JOHN P. VICKERY
ANNJANICE S. VOGAN
ROGER L. VOGEL III
BEAU S. VOMASTIC
ADAM J. WAGGONER
PHILIP M. WAGGONER
MATT D. WAGNER
IAN M. WAGONER
WINDY R. WALDREP
CHARLES F. WALL
ANTHONY J. WARNER
COREY B. WARREN
THOMAS R. WARREN
WILLIAM W. WASH
JOHN N. WAUGH
JASON R. WEBB
MICHAEL M. WELLOCK
SIMON P. WELTE
HERMAN B. WEST
JEREMY W. WHEELER
JENNIFER L. WHITE
THOMAS A. WHITEHEAD
THOMAS WHITFIELD II
NATHAN H. WHITNEY
JOSHUA I. WILES
JAYSON N. WILLIAMS
MEGAN R. WILLIAMS
NICHOLAS C. WILLIAMS
THOMAS M. WILLIAMS
CLAUDIA E. WILMOTH
BYRON W. WILSON, JR.
JAMES C. WILTSE
JASON A. WINKELMANN
BRADLEY J. WINN
SCOTT E. WOHLFORD
KEVIN A. WOLF
ELIZABETH A. WOMBLE
NOBLE B. WONSETLER
MATTHEW E. WOODS
CLINTON R. WOODY
SHAILIN YNACAY

TALON C. YOUNG
JOSEPH A. YURKOVICH
JOHN M. ZDEB
ROMAS J. ZIMLICKI
CHRISTOPHER D. ZOTTER
D015455
D012723
D014576
D014868
D013596
D012277
D015559
D012710
D014948
D015331
D015509
D014777
D012998
D015434
D013972
D011856
D013343
D013809
D011804
D015513
D014990
G010472
D013000
D013909
D015578
D011558
D015500
D015260

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

To be lieutenant colonel

JI E. AHN
R. Z. ALESSIFRIEDLANDER
CHRISTOPHER M. ALEXANDER
DANIEL R. ALEXANDER
JESSE R. ALLGEYER
CRAIG ANDERSON
JEFFREY G. ANDERSON
SCOTT T. ANDERSON
JUDITH ANTOINE
ALEXANDER N. APOSTLE
STEPHAN J. ARNOLD
MATTHEW P. AUBRY
CARLO U. AVERGAS
LONI R. AYERS
TRAVIS R. BAILEY
CHRISTOPHER J. BALDWIN
JOHN L. BANNISTER
JAVAN A. BARKER
BRIAN L. BARNETT
ALLJA BASIC
STEPHANIE L. BAUGH
DAVID J. BEAUDOIN
DAVID W. BELL
STEVEN C. BELL
JOHN I. BENNER
BARBARA P. BENSON
ADAM T. BET
GREGORY E. BEW
COLLIN A. BISSELL
ANDREW T. BLICKHAHN
BRIAN P. BOSSE
BRIAN J. BOURQUE
DWAYNE E. BOWDEN
CHRISTINA M. BOWSER
GERALD G. BRADEN
LAYONE S. BRADSHAW
ODENE C. BRATHWAITE
CLEOPHUS K. BRELAND
JARED W. BRITZ
CAROLYN B. BRONSON
SPENCER BROWN
KERRY K. BRUNAIS
MATTHEW L. BRYANT
JASON M. BUCKINGHAM
CORTIS B. BURGESS
ALEXANDER D. BURGOS
CHANTALINE P. CABAN
MILTON A. CAMPBELL, JR.
JASON F. CANO
CHRISTOPHER J. CARBONE
AMELIA D. CARTER
ROBERT D. CARTER
LELAND S. CASE
NANCY J. CASTRO
ANTHONY R. CATO
SETH L. CHAPPELL
JONATHAN C. CHEEK
BEN H. CHOE
ANDREW E. CHOVANCEK
ADAM R. CHRISTENSON
AGNES C. M. CHU
ANTHONY M. CLAS
JABBAR N. COLBERT
JOHN T. COOLEY
JOSEPH A. COSCI, JR.
ADAIR L. COX
CHET W. CRAW
JAMES M. CREASON
SAKURA CREEDON
GEORGE H. CUSHMAN V
TODD E. DAHMANN
GARY A. DALES
CHRISTOPHER R. DARLING
ERIK M. DAVIS
RUSSELL T. DESTREMPES
BRADLEY W. DIEBOLD
IAN M. DIETZ
SHAWN W. DILLINGHAM

THOMAS P. DIRIENZO
MICHAEL L. DONEGAN
ANDREW J. DORNSTADTER
ANDREA G. DOVER
RACHEL B. DOWNING
MAC H. ECHIPARE III
DANA G. EISENMAN
ALEX J. EISIMINGER
ALBERT G. ELAM III
SANQUANETTA L. ELLIS
BRETT D. EVANS
JULIE A. EVANS
LUCAS B. FALLOT
MELODY L. FAULKENBERRY
MATTHEW S. FECHTER
ALBA N. FELCH
ANTHONY J. FENNELL
STEVEN R. FERENZI
JARED N. FERGUSON
KAREEM Y. FERNANDEZ
MICHAEL C. FISH
BRADLEY R. FISHER
NEAL J. FISHER
NOKENS FLEURIEJEAN
ROBERTO R. PONSECA
SALVATORE C. FORLENZA
KRISTOFER D. FORMOE
MICHAEL O. FREELAND, JR.
KENNETH R. FRENCH
TROY S. PREY
THERESA N. PULLEN
MINDI C. FURNIER
JACQUELYN R. GALLIHER
DEREK J. GEDMINTAS
EFREM S. GIBSON
JOSEPH A. GIBSON
RICHARD W. GIBSON
JAMES S. GILL
CHRISTOPHER M. GIN
MICHAEL A. GLOVER
MATTHEW A. GONCALVES
NICHOLAS D. GOSHEN
FRANCESCA A. GRAHAM
WILLIAM D. GRATE
MICHAEL E. CRATER
ADAM R. GREGORY
RANDALL S. GRIGGS
BRENDAN M. HAGAN
JONATHAN D. HALEY
JASON K. HALUB
LISA R. HALVORSON
HENRY HAMA
ROBERT T. HAMILTON
PATRICK K. HARDIN
BRADLEY J. HARDY
ETHAN F. HAYES
WALTER G. HEDRICK IV
SAMUEL A. HEIDER
RICARDO HENRY
NATHAN P. HEPLER
PETER D. HOBIE
JACOB S. HINA
KATHRYN R. HOEJJE
DAVID M. HOLBROOK
DAVID E. HOLBROOKS
WILLIAM F. HOLLOWAY
JONATHAN P. HOWARD
RYAN A. HOWRY
MICHAEL S. HUBBARD
CLIFTON J. HUBBERT
GREGORY V. HUMBLE
STEPHEN S. HWANG
CLARENCE D. INGE, JR.
ELIJAH E. INGRAM
EVAN J. ISAAC
JAMES A. JABLONSKI
ANGEL K. JACKSON
CHANE R. JACKSON
JACOB M. JENDREY
LOUIS L. JENKINS
MICHAEL K. JOHN
CODY R. JOHNSON
DANIEL W. JOHNSON
DAVID W. JOHNSON
JASON M. JOHNSON
GARY D. JONES
GILBERT JUAREZ
JOSEPH C. KACHMAR II
KEITH M. KACMAR
PANAGIOTI I. KALOGIROS
NOELANI N. KALUHIWA
DEREK M. KAMACHI
JONATHAN P. KATL
JEFFREY D. KEENAN
ROBERT L. KELLUM
DANIEL J. KEMPEN
RYAN J. KENNY
JASON S. KIM
ROSALYN S. KING
LISA M. KIRBY
JARED R. KITE
JOSHUA M. KLATZKO
MICHAEL S. KLIPSTEIN
JONATHAN S. KNAFTON
OWEN W. KOCH
BRADLEY R. KOERNER
MICHAEL S. KOLTON
NICHOLAS J. KRAMER
HITOSHI KUMAGAI
FRANK J. KUZMINSKI
MERLIN J. KYNASTON
WALTER F. LANDGRAF
RODNEY A. LANDRUM
BRITTON A. LANDRY
MICHAEL LANGAN
CLARENCE E. LANGLEY III
DONELL D. LANGLEY

MATTHEW A. LAROCO
TIMOTHY J. LAWRENCE
TIMOTHY W. LAWSON
ZERORY LAWSON, JR.
MARYCATHERINE LEACH
GREGORY M. LECLAIR
MICHAEL G. LEMAY
ZACHERY B. LEONARD
ANDREW G. LERCH
WAIMAN LEUNG
CHRISTIAN A. LIGHTSEY
SHAD K. LLOYD
DOUGLAS A. LOCKE
THOMAS J. LOUX
JOHN E. LUCKIE
SERGEY L. LUZHANSKIY
JASON C. MACCONNELL
LAUREN R. MALONEY
EINAR D. MANKI
JOHN P. MANN
BURKE A. MANWARING
DEREK C. MARTIN
JOHNATHAN P. MARTIN
JUAN L. MARTINEZ
TROY E. MASON
MOHAMED B. MASSAQUOI
DAVID A. MATTERS
LEON H. MATTHIAS
ANTHONY MAYNE
QUENTIN D. MCCART
SEAN D. MCENTEE
RORY M. MCGOVERN
NICHOLAS J. MCINTEE
BENJAMIN F. MCKINLEY
TAMEIKA MCNAUGHTEN
SEAN C. MCNICHOL
SHAWN P. MCNICOL
JONATHAN L. MECHAM
RICKIE R. MEERS, JR.
NATALIA R. MERCEDES
ANDREW J. MERCHALANT
KEVIN A. MERTHEW
CHEAVIS J. MERTT
JACOB I. MEYER
MICHAEL W. MEYERS
DARRYL D. MIDDLEBROOK
TIMOTHY M. MIGLIORE
ADHIMA MILLER
DAVID T. MILLER
MARC W. MILLER
MICHAEL A. E. MILLER
SETH MILLER
GARRICK P. MINOR
CHRISTIAN M. MITCHELL
TYLER J. MITCHELL
LUKE C. MOEN
SARAH K. MOFFITT
BARRON J. MOFFITT
MATTHEW D. MOGENSEN
DANIEL MONROY, JR.
DELANTE E. MOORE
NATHAN A. MOORE
JASON R. MORALES
ARTHUR V. MORGAN
BRYAN W. MORGAN
GABRIEL L. MORRIS
JOSEPH H. MIROSZCZYK
SCOTT T. MUELLER
LAURA E. MUIRHEAD
EROL K. MUNIE
SONIE L. MUNSON
ROBERT F. MURRAY
MICHAEL J. NAU
JAMEY D. NEALY
ANTHONY G. NELSON
JESSE M. NESBITT
GLEN S. NETTROUR
JACQUELINE M. NEWELL
CHRISTINE Y. NGAI
MICHAEL A. NYSTROM
JARED K. NYSTROM
BRIAN C. OBERMERA
DAVID J. OGURA
JOHN M. OLIVER
KARL M. OLSON
RIKKE A. OPPERMAN
GINO E. OREZZOLI
JOSEPH A. ORR
JOSEPH O. OWOEYE
NICHOLAS B. PACE
MATTHEW J. PACHECO
MATTHEW J. PAINTER
ANTHONY J. PALUMBO
LEA J. PARKER
ROBERT W. PARKER
JEREMY B. PASSUT
CHARLES W. PATTERSON
JOSHUA A. PATTON
JONATHAN L. PAYNTER
MICHAEL J. PEDERSON
COLBY PEON
JONATHAN Q. PEREZ
DARIO PEREZBIRRIEL
ALEXANDER D. PERSCHALL
BRANDON M. PETRICK
SAYTHALA PHONEXAYPHOVA
NICHOLAS B. PICKFORD
DAVID M. PIERCE
AARON M. POE
NICHOLAS G. POPPEN
JACOB R. PRATER
MARIO A. QUEVEDO
CONSTANCE G. QUINLAN
MAXIMILLIAN A. RENARD
JENYA M. RHONE
JASON L. RICHARDSON
KOURTLAWN D. RICHARDSON

HEATHER I. RITCHEY
LUIS D. RIVERAFONSECA
DAVID RODRIGUEZ
DOUGLAS G. ROGERS
JOHN R. ROOD
JASON P. ROSE
KAREN A. ROXBERRY
SEAN M. RUFOLO
KEVIN M. RYAN
KEILA M. SANCHEZERAZO
KRISTINA L. SANDERS
BENJAMIN L. SASS
LEON R. SATCHELL
JEFFREY C. SCHIMIZZE
STEVEN L. SCHMIDT
FRITZ J. SCHULTES
JOSEPH M. SCHULTZ
GAVIN D. SCHWAN
ERIK J. SEDLOCK
AARON D. SELPH
DOUG K. SEROTA
JASON M. SHAFER
JUSTIN S. SHAFER
TEREMUURA T. SHAMEL
ANDREW K. SHEALY
MATTHEW R. SHEFTIC
BRANDON C. SHELLEY
WILLIAM W. SHELTON
MARK E. SHUMAN
NICHOLAS W. SIKES
EMIRO M. SINNING
JOSHUA C. SISSON
GARRETT W. SLACK
THOMAS M. SLYKHUIS
PAUL M. SMITH
RICHARD K. SMITH
SYLVAN A. SMITH
JOHNPAUL A. SMOCK
LARON C. SOMERVILLE
VICTOR E. SOMNUK
MORGAN J. SPRINGGLACE
JODY E. STACY
BRITTIANE V. STATON
DAVID E. SPATON
DAMONICA C. SUMPTER
MAIA M. SUSUICO
VICTORIA S. SZILAGYI
GILL T. TATMANTYREE, JR.
DANNY P. THEBEAU II
JAMES H. THOMAS
KARENSA D. THOMAS
MARK E. THOMPSON
OSCAR D. THOMPSON
DEREK A. THORNTON
JOSHUA H. THYER
ALEX C. TIGNOR
EDWARD W. TIMMONS
JESSICA F. TOPHAM
CHRISTOPHER P. TOWNSEND
LANCE C. TURNER
CRISTOPHER M. ULRICH
RONALD C. UNDERWOOD
NICKLAS J. VANSTRAATEN
MARCO A. VELA
MARC C. VIELLEDENT
JOHN A. VOTOVICH
AMBER M. WALKER
MERRILL W. WALKER
MICHAEL S. WALKER
CHARLES B. WALSH II
TRAVIS R. WALTER
DANIEL L. WEISS
WILLIAM S. WHITESEL
JOHN F. WIEBELD
SHAUN M. WILD
DAVID D. WILKINSON
CHARLES A. WILLIAMS
JAMES R. WILLIAMS
JAMES C. WILSON
BENJAMIN C. WISNOSKI
WARREN A. WITTHROW
JOSEPH S. WITMER
CECIL E. WOLBERTON
JESSE L. WOOD
KEITH A. WOODBURN
JAMAR E. WRIGHT
EINAR J. WULFSBERG
JOHANNA T. WYNNE
KYLE M. YANOWSKI
SEAN M. YARROLL
DANIEL R. YOUNG
DEREK R. YOUNG
JONATHAN D. YOUNG, JR.
THEODORE L. ZAGRANISKI
WOJCIECH ZAJAC
ANDREW P. ZAPP
JUSTIN ZEVENBERGEN
D014895
D011786
D015053
G010671
G010128
D014382
G010618
D015457
D014872
D015445
G010163
D015148
D015626
D013546
D013273
G010188
G010539

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

To be lieutenant colonel

MELINDA J. ACUNA
 DEATAE A. ALLEN
 KENNISHA N. ALLEN
 CATHY G. ALSTON
 JUAN A. AMADOR
 ALEXANDER J. AMATO
 XKOSHAN L. ARNOLD
 DEREK L. ASHE
 STEPHEN A. BARAN
 RANDALL S. BARTEL
 JOSEPH P. BAUMBACH
 MATTHEW C. BENDER
 MICHAEL B. BENDER
 DENNIS W. BERNACKI
 THOMAS A. BEYERL
 MARIA BINGHAM
 BRANDON D. BOATWRIGHT
 ROBYN E. BOEHRINGER
 TAMMY S. BOGART
 SCOTTY BOLER
 TARA J. BOWMAN
 JUSTIN A. BOYD
 BRIAN L. BRAITHWAITE
 THOMAS D. BREWINGTON
 ZACHERY A. BRISCOE
 JOSEPH L. BROWN
 JOSEPH W. BROWN
 KEITH W. BROWN
 KYLE W. BROWN
 PAUL A. BROWN
 JOHN W. BURNETT
 MICHAEL R. CALDWELL
 JOEL CALOFIGUEROA
 THOMAS M. CAMPEAU
 TIFFANY L. L. CARLISLE
 CATHERINE C. CARLSON
 TED L. CHA
 TREVOR L. CHAMBERS
 ERICA E. CHIN
 ANGELA N. CHIPMAN
 MONICA K. R. CLAYTON
 PAUL E. CLUVERIUS
 DANIEL W. COLE
 SARAH E. COMEAU
 MELISSA C. COMISKEY
 BRADLEY J. COOPER
 ALBERTO CORDOVA
 NATHANIEL P. COSTA
 ANA M. COWAN
 RYAN M. CROSBY
 DANIEL E. CROSS
 MARCIA L. DAILEY
 DEBORAH A. DALEY
 MICHAEL G. DAVIDSON
 MANDOLYN R. DAVILA
 BRENT L. DAVIS
 OLIVER E. DAVIS
 TIMOTHY G. DAVIS
 KIMBERLY A. DEATON
 JENNIFER M. DEMBECK
 CHRISTOPHER J. DENTON
 SHANE D. DERING
 JOEL A. DICKEY
 DESIREE S. DIRIGE
 THADDEUS J. DOUTHITT
 GERARD J. DOW, SR.
 GLEN R. DOWLING
 TRAVIS S. DRAYTON
 NICHOLAS R. DRURY
 JESSICA L. DUNN
 BENJAMIN R. ECKLOR
 MEGHAN V. EDERLE
 JOHN A. ELKO
 MICHELLE L. ELWOOD
 ENRIQUE A. ENRIQUEZ
 PATRICK O. ESSENBERG
 DANIEL S. EUSEBIO
 JAMES E. FAGER
 KEVIN M. FEFFERMAN
 KRISTYN M. FELIX
 BRIAN C. FIDDERMON
 JOSHUA W. FORD
 KENNETH B. FOWLER
 TROY F. FOX
 CHRISTOPHER R. FRANKLIN
 LAURAJANE R. FREELAND
 ROBERT E. FREEMAN, JR.
 MICHAEL V. GALLUCCI
 MICHAEL A. GALVIN
 JEFFREY R. GAMBLE
 CHRISTIAN L. GATBONTON
 LESTER S. GEBSKI
 PETER A. GEORGE
 JAMES E. GERLING
 SARAH B. GILBERT
 TIMOTHY G. GODWIN
 JOSE A. GRANT
 DUSTIN R. GRAY
 MICHAEL B. GRAY
 CHARLES T. GREENE
 JEDMUND W. GREENE
 TOMETRIUS GREER
 DAVID M. GREGORY
 JAMES O. GRUBE
 WILLIAM P. GUMABON
 MARSHAL K. HAMMEL
 ALISHA C. HAMMETT
 DEVIN K. HAMMOND
 BRADLEY C. HAMRICK
 PETER J. HAN
 YUNSONG HAN
 JEFFERY D. HANCE

JONATHAN C. HATHAWAY
 JOHN C. HATLEY
 JAMES E. HAYES
 DONALD A. HAYFRON
 JAIME S. HENDERSON
 NATHAN D. HENDRIKS
 EMPERATRIZ HENRIQUEZ
 KODY W. HERNANDEZ
 TIFFANY N. HINES
 LARRY W. HIRT
 MELISSA L. HOAGLIN
 KEVIN L. HOFFMAN
 BRIAN L. HOLLANDSWORTH
 CRISTOFFER S. HONAN
 DAVID K. HONG
 AMY N. HOOD
 KEVIN A. HOWELL
 JAMES D. HUBBARD
 MICHAEL J. HUBER
 RYAN T. HULSE
 IAN J. JARVIS
 CHRISTOPHER C. JO
 HARDY O. JOHNSON
 ROBERT L. JOHNSON
 BRIAN G. JONES
 JERRY L. JONES
 RICHARD E. JONES
 KEITH A. JORDAN
 JONATHAN W. JUDY
 AARON M. KIA
 KENNETH M. KIM
 EDWIN L. KOLEN
 DANIEL L. KOSTERS
 KORY A. KRAMER
 JOHN C. KUMP
 SEAN S. KWOUN
 PATRICK A. LANIER
 CHARLES S. LAWRENCE
 DONALD M. LEE
 TERA S. LERCH
 BENJAMIN T. LOVING
 ENRIQUE LOY
 DERRICK E. LUCARELLI
 NICHOLAS J. LUCAS
 ERIC M. MAIA
 MICHAEL J. MARTIN
 MICHAEL J. MARTIN III
 MICHAEL W. MARTIN
 MICHAEL A. MARTINEZ
 MICHELLE E. MARTINEZ
 HILDRED S. MATHEWS
 JOHN R. MAURO
 CHRISTOPHER R. MAY
 EBRIMA F. MBAI
 MCFERRIN D. MCDONALD
 HEATHER A. MCDUGALL
 PHILIP M. MCDOWELL
 MILAGROS J. MEDINA
 LUKE V. MEDVEGY
 JOAQUIN M. MENO
 ERICA L. MILLER
 JASON M. MILLER
 THOMAS M. MOHLER
 CHRISTINE G. MOORE
 DAVID B. MOORE
 GEOFFERY G. MOSLEY
 BRANDON G. MOTTE
 KEITH M. MUEHLING
 JEREMY T. MUELLER
 JONATHAN R. MULDER
 HEATH A. MULLINS
 KEVIN N. NELSON
 MINH V. NGUYEN
 PAUL A. NOCE
 JI H. OH
 RONALD W. OPPERMAN
 MICHAEL A. PACHUCKI
 EMMA PARSONS
 WANSY PAUL
 ANTWON L. PERSON
 JANET PETEFOX
 SHAWN O. PEYNADO
 THOMAS H. PFARR
 LUCIANO F. PICCO
 WINFIELD S. PINKSTAFF
 KRISTEN M. PLASSMEYER
 JONATHAN E. L. PLOTKIN
 EMILY S. POOLE
 RIECHARDE T. PRENELL
 ROBERT J. PUENTE
 EDUARDO PUMAREJO
 MICHAEL T. QUIGLEY
 JACOB J. QUINN
 SEAN J. QUINN
 STEVEN A. RAVEIA
 DEAN R. RAY
 MARISSA M. REED
 KIMBERLY L. REMBERT
 ANDY REYES
 JULIO J. REYES
 MARCELLA A. L. REYNOLDS
 KIRBY D. RICE
 BRYAN E. RIDDLE
 ALPHONSE T. RIDEAU
 ANDREW D. RIECK
 CARLOS A. RIVAS
 BRANDON K. ROBINSON
 DANIEL B. ROBINSON
 CLIPTON E. ROGERS
 CORINTHIA A. ROMAIN
 MARIANO ROSARIO
 BRYSON R. ROSSOL
 TRAVIS W. RUDGE
 MICAH P. RUE

TROND S. RUUD
 AMBER L. RYDER
 ADAM A. SALAZAR
 MANUEL D. SANCHEZDIAZ
 JOSHUA M. SANDLER
 MARK A. SCHAUMBURG
 STEVEN M. SCHNURR
 MARK L. SCOTT, JR.
 CASEY M. SECKENDORF
 JONATHAN M. SEITER
 ZAMBIA SEYMORE
 MISHENDA S. SIGGAL
 XEON O. SIMPSON
 JOHN D. SMITH, JR.
 KYLE A. SMITH
 STEPHEN B. SMITH
 ROBERT C. SOLANO
 BRADLEY B. SON
 MICHAEL SPEARS
 OLIVER STOLLEY
 EDWARD F. STRZALKOWSKI
 RYAN D. SUNDERMAN
 HOWARD M. SWANSON, JR.
 ABRAHAM T. SWEENEY
 HUNG J. TA
 BONITA A. TAPLINSADIQ
 LIONEL A. TAYLOR
 CARSON L. TENNEY
 EBONY S. THOMAS
 RICHARD N. THORNBERG
 LAWRENCE TORRES
 DANIEL F. TOVEN
 PATRICK A. TURNER
 PHILIP T. TURNER
 DAVID A. VANAKIN
 EMANUEL VELEZ
 CHARLES G. WAITES
 BENJAMIN J. WALKER
 AMANDA D. WATKINS
 ADRIAN N. WATTS
 MATTHEW E. WERNERT
 REGINALD V. WHITE
 LATIA K. WICKLIFFE
 CHRISTOPHER M. WILLIAMS
 JOHN M. WILLIAMS II
 KATHERINE R. WILLIAMS
 SHARRON D. WILLIAMS
 YOLANDA G. WILLIAMS
 TOBY M. WILLIFORD
 BRENT J. WILSON
 DANIEL C. WILSON
 TAMILA A. WILSON
 ANDRE D. WINDING
 MATHIS F. WRIGHT
 MICHELLE R. WYLIE
 LINDA S. WYNN
 LAWRENCE C. YARNALL III
 NICHOLAS P. YERBY
 SHAWN YONKIN
 PETER S. YOON
 MATTHEW A. ZAYD
 D012207
 D014830
 D014835
 D014336
 D015679
 D015019
 D015483
 D011138

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

To be lieutenant colonel

TALON G. ANDERSON
 ALAN M. BAIRLEY
 MICHAEL A. BARRY
 JAMES D. M. BEALL
 BRIAN W. BURBANK
 VICTOR J. CARRERAS
 DANIEL W. CLARK
 HERBERT CONTRERAS
 CHRISTOPHER M. COOK
 DUSTIN R. CRAPSE
 JOHN P. CRUZ
 CHRISTOPHER DENATALE
 LESLY J. DENIS
 MARK A. EVANS
 STEVEN N. FEIGH
 EMMET J. GARIEPY
 LUIS N. GAYTAN
 DOUGLAS C. HEALY
 GREGORY R. HINNER
 JOSEPH J. KOSTURKO IV
 JASON M. LINGK
 JEFFREY T. LITTLE
 SCOTT F. MEENEN
 BENJAMIN D. MEIER
 KEVIN T. MERRILL
 JOSEPH A. PAZCOGUIN
 SHAWN G. ROBERTSON
 JOSHUA B. RYKOWSKI
 DONALD E. SEDIVY
 CHAN Y. SHIN
 TERRIE W. SHIN
 DEONAND S. SINGH
 BENJAMIN W. STEGMANN
 JOHN C. TOLIN
 JUDE T. VERGE
 DAVID J. ZALLO
 D015287
 D014845