

(3) to the extent practicable, an assessment of the number of individuals in the region in forced labor camps;

(4) a description of the methods used by People's Republic of China authorities to "reeducate" detainees in internment camps, including a list of government agencies of the People's Republic of China in charge of such reeducation;

(5) an assessment of the use and nature of forced labor in and related to the detention of Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, including a description of foreign companies and industries directly benefitting from such labor;

(6) an assessment of the level of access to Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region granted by the Government of the People's Republic of China to foreign diplomats and consular agents, independent journalists, and representatives of nongovernmental organizations;

(7) an assessment of the mass surveillance, predictive policing, and other methods used by the Government of the People's Republic of China to violate the human rights of persons in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(8) a description of the frequency with which foreign governments are forcibly returning Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and other refugees and asylum seekers to the People's Republic of China;

(9) a description, as appropriate, of United States diplomatic efforts with allies and other nations—

(A) to address the gross violations of human rights in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) to protect asylum seekers from the region; and

(10) the identification of the offices within the Department of State that are responsible for leading and coordinating the diplomatic efforts referred to in paragraph (9).

**SEC. 8. REPORT ON PROTECTING CITIZENS AND RESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM INTIMIDATION AND COERCION.**

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that outlines all of the efforts to protect United States citizens and residents, including ethnic Uyghurs and Chinese nationals legally studying or working temporarily in the United States, who have experienced harassment or intimidation within the United States by officials or agents of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

**SEC. 9. REPORT ON SECURITY AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF REPRESSION IN XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives on the matters described in subsection (b).

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the national and regional security threats posed to the United States by the policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(2) a description of—

(A) the acquisition or development of technology by the Government of the People's Republic of China to facilitate internment and mass surveillance in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, including technology related to predictive policing and large-scale data collection and analysis; and

(B) the threats that the acquisition, development, and use of such technologies pose to the United States;

(3) a list of Chinese companies that are involved in—

(A) constructing or operating the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; or

(B) providing or operating mass surveillance technology in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(4) a description of the role of the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps in internment and forced labor in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

**SEC. 10. CLASSIFIED REPORT.**

The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with such elements of the Intelligence Community as the Director deems appropriate, shall submit a classified report to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that assesses the ability of the United States Government to collect and analyze intelligence regarding—

(1) the scope and scale of the detention and forced labor of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in the People's Republic of China;

(2) the gross violations of human rights perpetrated inside the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(3) other policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region that constitute gross violations of human rights.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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. CORNYN. 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. CORNYN. Mr. President, since the Senate returned to Washington 2 weeks ago after about a 6-week hiatus, we have accomplished quite a bit on a bipartisan basis. We have confirmed national security nominees; we have held hearings to examine liability limitations, coronavirus testing, safely getting back to work and school, and the impact of the pandemic on broadband. In short, the Senate has been working, on a bipartisan basis, to understand the challenges that this virus has created so we can provide targeted reforms.

It certainly seems to be a different approach than the one taken by the House. Earlier this week, House Democrats released a so-called coronavirus relief bill. You might say they kind of mailed it in because they haven't been here for the last 2 weeks, but it has an absolutely staggering pricetag—\$3 trillion, with a "t." That is more than we spent in the first four coronavirus response bills combined.

I tell my constituents, when I am talking to them on a videoconference call or teleconference, that 2 months ago, I never would have imagined that the Senate would be voting on trillion-dollar bills, but now apparently the House wants to make this a routine way to do business and particularly without much debate.

As astounding as that figure is, the biggest issue with that bill isn't the cost or the fact that Speaker PELOSI and her party drafted it in secret but that they released the 1,800-page bill text on Tuesday, and they plan to vote on it tomorrow. Unbelievable.

It would be an understatement to say there are concerns with this kind of legislating. I would call it legislative malpractice, to be kind. It is not just from Republicans or the administration or the American people; the Speaker's own Members are begging for additional time to review this massive bill. Unlike the previous coronavirus response bills passed here in Congress, there have been no bipartisan discussions in the production of that bill from the House—not with House Republicans, not with the administration, and certainly not with us. I can assure you that this legislation looks just like the kind of product that you would expect from that type of flawed process. It is partisan; it is unaffordable; it is unrealistic; and it stands absolutely no chance of becoming law.

We all know that legislation drafted in a vacuum by one political party in one Chamber isn't a good-faith effort to try to survive, much less address, this pandemic crisis. It is a political statement as much as anything else, a liberal wish list which, if passed—which it will not be—would sink us further in debt without the benefit of addressing the problems we are actually facing.

When this legislation was announced, Speaker PELOSI said:

We all know we must put more money in the pockets of the American people. This is not only necessary for their survival, but it is also a stimulus to the economy.

But the ones set to reap the biggest benefits from this bill aren't the ones struggling to make ends meet. Actually, what Speaker PELOSI is apparently trying to do is help some of the wealthiest people in America.

This legislation would reinstate the so-called SALT deduction—the State and local tax deduction—and thrust that burden of subsidizing the wealthiest people in the bluest parts of the country on the rest of us. We were able to cap that in a fair and realistic way in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Prior to that tax reform, taxpayers who itemized their returns could deduct the amount of State and local taxes they paid with no limit. So, if you lived in a high-tax State like New York, there was no limit to your ability to deduct those State and local taxes. You know who paid for it? The people of Indiana, the people of Alaska, the people of Texas, and the people of other States who more responsibly dealt with their fiscal affairs.

Now, for the average American, this change hasn't even been a blip on the radar screen. For the millionaires and billionaires, though, the ones Speaker PELOSI's bill would benefit most directly, this was a huge blow.

People say, well, the wealthy ought to pay more. Well, OK. Here is a way for them to do it in the right way, but it is also a way to hold your State and local jurisdictions accountable for the high taxes they pass, only to previously allow those taxes to be deducted from the Federal income tax, so this is a matter of political accountability for them, too.

I am sure the wealthiest Americans were delighted to see that the Democrats' response to what Speaker PELOSI called the biggest catastrophe in our Nation's history would allow them, once again, to reap the benefits of this no-limit deduction. If the SALT cap were removed, they would receive an average tax cut of nearly \$60,000. That is higher than the household income for many Texans and many Americans. To make matters worse, this would sink our country further in debt.

The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Tax estimates that doing away with the SALT cap would cost about \$700 billion over the next 7 years, with almost 95 percent of the benefit going to those making at least \$200,000 and more than half going to those making more than \$1 million a year.

Now, we have spent a lot of money in the last couple of months, but we have done so in the face of an emergency—kind of like the civilian equivalent of World War II—fighting this virus, both the public health and the economic consequences, so we are already looking at staggering debt that we are going to have to deal with at some point because it is immoral to expect our kids and grandkids to pay that money back after we have already cashed those checks.

But this just adds insult to injury, what Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats are trying to do. Even the liberal Tax Policy Center reported that one-third of the SALT deduction went to the top 1 percent. We hear our Democrat friends talk about income inequality and the top 1 percent needing to pay more. Well, then, their actions are directly contrary to their rhetoric. We know 80 percent of the benefit went to the top 20 percent income earners.

Now, we are not trying to start a civil war here between people who are doing well and people who are not doing well, but this just makes abso-

lutely no sense, particularly in the face of a crisis like the coronavirus. This isn't an attempt to support those who are struggling to make ends meet. That is who we ought to be focusing on: the people who are not getting a paycheck because their business has been shut down, their restaurant, their bar, their sports stadium. This is a get-out-of-jail-free card for millionaires and billionaires who don't want to pay their fair share of taxes and would foist that unfairly onto others.

Now, I realize that is only a small portion of the bill. After all, it is a \$3 trillion bill. So let's dive into a couple of other things—changes, for example, they would make in unemployment insurance. The CARES Act we passed—I think it was March 25—expanded unemployment benefits to include workers who would not typically be eligible for those benefits, the self-employed and independent contractors. It also provided an additional \$600 of Federal benefit on top of the State's unemployment benefit through the end of July, for 4 months.

The theory behind that was to provide workers who lost their jobs with the money they needed to pay for the necessities of life until the economy could reopen and they could go back to work.

Slowly but surely, businesses across this country are starting to reopen their doors—safely and gradually reopen their doors—and many are facing an unlikely burden, which is now getting people to come back to work. Over the last several weeks, I have heard Texas businesses struggling to rehire their employees because they are making more from unemployment than they would if they worked.

And it is not an isolated issue. According to the Texas Workforce Commission that administers our unemployment insurance program, 80 percent of the people are making more money on unemployment than they were when previously employed—80 percent.

Now, that clearly was a mistake in the underlying bill. It is true that, when you do something that big and that fast, you are going to make some mistakes, but nobody can think this is sound public policy: to pay people more for not working than when they do work.

Here is what House Democrats do. They extend that mistake through next January, providing even less of an incentive for workers to find new jobs. The United States can't be the successful economy that we are capable of being or have been by encouraging people not to work. At a certain point, these benefits are going to do more harm than good, and I would say they are already starting to do that. So, extending unemployment benefits to next year would deter people from trying to return to work because, why would they? Why would someone choose to do more work for less money?

Well, I understand the need to support the American people until they

are able to get back on their feet, but I am afraid this move would stunt—would retard—any hope of economic recovery, and it would deepen the hiring struggle businesses are already facing—and I am glad that they are hiring—and ensure that the “Sorry, we're closed” sign remains on the door of Main Street businesses throughout the country.

As we begin to recover from the economic crisis that this virus has caused, our country will need a lot more from Congress than a blank check written in a back room. Rushing to appear to do something while doing absolutely nothing, which is what House Democrats have done, will not do any good unless we are taking the time to find out what America's healthcare professionals, small businesses, and workers actually need.

That is what we are doing every day: listening. How is what we have already done working? What are the mistakes that need to be corrected? Where are the gaps that need to be filled—at a time when about a half-trillion dollars of that money from the CARES Act isn't even out the door yet from the Main Street lending facility that is being set up through the Federal Reserve.

I am not blaming Treasury. I am just saying, they are covered up, and they are working 24/7, but let's see how what we have already done works before we continue to shovel more money aimlessly out the door.

Earlier this week, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing to examine liability around the coronavirus pandemic. One of our witnesses was Kevin Smartt, a Texan from Bonham, TX—the home of Sam Rayburn—who is CEO and President of Kwik Chek food stores. I think he has 47 fast-food stores. In his opening statement, he outlined the steps that Kwik Chek took to protect the safety of its employees and customers while continuing to provide access to essential items like food and fuel.

They followed the constantly shifting guidelines from the CDC and other Federal, State, and local government agencies and adjusted and adapted accordingly. Like millions of businesses across the country, Kwik Chek implemented strict cleaning protocols. They installed sneeze guards in their stores, they put markers on the floor to help customers maintain social distancing, and they made every effort to obtain masks and hand sanitizer, but have often struggled to overcome supply disruptions.

In his testimony, Kevin said:

Unfortunately, despite trying to do everything we can to protect the health and safety of our customers and employees during this pandemic, my companies now have targets on our back because our doors have remained open. That's just not right. We are all in this together, and my businesses shouldn't become targets for liability threats just because they serve their communities.

I found this is a common fear for businesses small and large alike, as

well as for our dedicated healthcare professionals. Can you imagine serving on the frontline of this fight against the pandemic, doing everything you can possibly do to help people who are sick and injured, and, despite acting in good faith to protect employees, customers, or patients, we know that a certain element of the bar are lining up to file opportunistic lawsuits against these hard-working men and women, people who I think we all consider to be heroes.

Across the country, lawsuits have already begun rolling in by the hundreds. Unless we take action, we are going to wake up from this pandemic only to find ourselves in a legal nightmare.

Now, I want to be clear. Bad actors don't deserve blanket immunity. We are all in agreement on that point, but hard-working Americans who are trying to do the best thing and follow, in good faith, the guidance that their government gives them deserve a safe harbor from frivolous litigation and nuisance lawsuits. This Chamber is full of lawyers—Democrat lawyers, Republican lawyers—who are well aware of just how damaging this unlimited litigation that will ensue will be on our economic recovery.

While House Democrats have been crafting their dead-on-arrival liberal wish list, we have been working on legislation which can and should gain bipartisan support and protect our frontline workers in the process.

We are working on legislation to provide liability protections for the men and women who have supported us through this crisis and who will be the key to our recovery from this crisis. We simply must protect those who have acted in good faith from having to defend costly legal battles—only to win—only to lose their business because they can't survive that additional burden—going through the pandemic, the shutdown, only to find, just when you think you are coming out of it, that you are being drowned with litigation costs.

I believe we should continue to provide an opportunity to seek legal recourse for those who act willfully or exercise reckless disregard for the health and safety of others. Those are the kinds of cases that deserve, in my opinion, access to compensation.

Make no mistake, our country's road to recovery isn't going to be easy, and we have already caught a glimpse of the next epidemic, the lawsuit epidemic, that is waiting around the corner.

Unlike House Democrats, who are moving full-speed ahead, the Senate has chosen to tap the brakes and figure out the best way to avoid hitting the brakes, economically and from a public health perspective.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate to

proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 583 and 633 through 639 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, all en bloc, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows

#### IN THE ARMY

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer 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. Aaron R. Dean, II

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

#### To be brigadier general

Col. Michael W. Bank  
Col. Monica M. Brouse  
Col. Allan R. Cecil  
Col. Michael A. Comstock  
Col. Kevin V. Doyle  
Col. Akshai M. Gandhi  
Col. Thomas C. Hannon  
Col. Thomas J. James  
Col. David W. Manson  
Col. John J. Ptak, Jr.  
Col. Michael D. Stohler  
Col. Edwin A. VanDerWolde  
Col. Mark A. Vavra

#### IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Gary M. Brito

#### IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

#### To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Carl P. Chebi  
Rear Adm. (lh) David A. Goggins  
Rear Adm. (lh) Douglas W. Small

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. Rick Freedman

The following named officers 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. Susan Bryerjoyner  
Capt. John A. Watkins

The following named officers 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. Mark A. Melson  
Capt. Michael S. Sciretta

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade

indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

#### To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Eugene H. Black, III

#### NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

#### IN THE ARMY

PN1463 ARMY nominations (965) beginning WILLIAM P. ABBOTT, and ending D015041, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1464 ARMY nominations (628) beginning DAVIS M. ABT, and ending D014989, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1465 ARMY nominations (628) beginning JAMIE E. ABEL, and ending D014063, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1466 ARMY nominations (40) beginning ADESOLA O. ADEPEGBA, and ending G010437, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1522 ARMY nomination of Jamal D. Snell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2020.

PN1640 ARMY nomination of Kelly L. French, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 2, 2020.

PN1696 ARMY nomination of William A. Forbes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN1366 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning JEFFREY T. JONES, II, and ending JUAN F. RODRIGUEZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1487 MARINE CORPS nominations (6) beginning MATTHEW S. BREEN, and ending REYES J. RIVAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1488-1 MARINE CORPS nominations (395) beginning BRETT D. ABBAMONTE, and ending JASON C. YURISIC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1658-1 MARINE CORPS nominations (106) beginning JOSHUA D. ANDERSON, and ending SCOTT W. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 2, 2020.

#### IN THE NAVY

PN1482 NAVY nomination of Daniel M. Wiegrefe, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1570 NAVY nomination of Katherine L. Jaudon, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 13, 2020.

PN1654 NAVY nomination of Paul D. Sargeant, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 2, 2020.

PN1657 NAVY nomination of Christopher C. Supko, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 2, 2020.

PN1697 NAVY nomination of James G. Buckley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.