

for our country. We will turn to legislation to strengthen the implementation of the Paycheck Protection Program for the workers and small businesses that are struggling to weather this storm. We will consider a bipartisan bill from Senators DAINES and GARDNER to safeguard America's abundant public lands. For the 60th consecutive year, we will also take up the National Defense Authorization Act to help guide the strategic and operational priorities of our Nation's Armed Forces in the face of evolving threats.

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, make no mistake, the foreign actors who seek to harm the United States have not let up while we have attended to other problems. For example, in Afghanistan, despite agreeing just months ago to engage in further peace negotiations with the Afghan Government and sever its ties with al-Qaida, the Taliban has, instead, continued its violent campaign against the Afghan people.

President Trump has expressed frustration with the Taliban's failures and is reportedly considering withdrawing from Afghanistan even more rapidly. Yet, as we weigh our options, we must not forget the painful lessons of the last administration's mistakes.

Former President Obama and Vice President Biden were intent on beating a hasty retreat from Iraq, conditions on the ground notwithstanding. Just as many of us warned at the time, their recklessness left a vacuum that terrorists and Iran readily filled. ISIS flourished. Tragically, the rest is history. The resulting chaos threatened our interests and drew American efforts back into the region.

By contrast, the Trump administration has seen a number of successes in this difficult region. The President's strategy has secured a territorial defeat of ISIS. It has put new pressure on Iran and given the Iraqi people a fighting chance, which their new government seems inclined to take.

Yet helping Iraq stand up to Iranian influence will not be an overnight project. Iran wants to drive the United States from the region. China and Russia would also be thrilled with a reduction of American presence and influence there. So, as we struggle to clean up the broken pieces of one rushed withdrawal, we need to avoid repeating those mistakes somewhere else.

I applaud the Trump administration for its approach thus far in Afghanistan. The President has taken constraints off U.S. forces. We have helped Afghan forces go after the terrorists. We have ratcheted up the costs on the Taliban, bolstered the Afghan forces that bear the brunt of the violence, and won international support for our mission there. We have done all of this with fewer resources and fewer personnel than during the previous two

administrations. The President's strategy and diplomacy have helped create a path for discussions among Afghans—the only thing that could actually secure the country's future.

If these qualified successes continue, it would be appropriate to further reduce our American presence as certain conditions are met, but we must retain enough forces and influence to maintain our counterterrorism capabilities. Given recent reports and our longstanding experience, we cannot just trust the Taliban will sever ties to al-Qaida and other terrorist networks. We need to be vigilant. We need to maintain enough presence to judge whether the Taliban complies with agreements and help the Afghan Government impose consequences if it does not. We need to maintain enough presence to preserve our strategic foothold against ISIS, the Haqqani Network, and al-Qaida. We should also maintain enough presence to help prevent a full replay of Iraq or Syria—a bloodbath and a human rights collapse, particularly for generations of Afghan women.

Last year, a bipartisan supermajority in the Senate voted for an amendment I authored, which warned against precipitous withdrawals from Afghanistan and Syria in ways that could jeopardize the hard-won progress we have attained, embolden Iran and Russia, and create more pain for us and everyone else in the future.

Our enemies would be thrilled if the United States would grow too tired to continue the hard work of standing with our partners, confronting our adversaries, and maintaining measured leadership that projects our security around the world. Our enemies would be delighted if we would grow too weary to act in our own long-term interest. We must not give them that satisfaction.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Anderson, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

PROTESTS AND BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, this has been a very difficult week after what has been a very difficult few months. A nation, beleaguered by disease and economic depression, has once again come face-to-face with the racial injustice that infects our society. The death of George Floyd in police custody was a searing reminder of a long list of unarmed African Americans whose lives have been taken under similar circumstances—Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, and too many others—a well of grief and loss and pain too deep to express. It was a searing reminder of the bigotry and discrimination that African Americans encounter as part of their daily reality.

That is why so many Americans of all ages, colors, and faiths are out in the streets protesting right now. They are fed up with racial injustice in this country and want to see some change. Here in the Senate, Member after Member has come to the floor to share support for the same cause.

Yesterday, our caucus held a somber, emotional, and very personal meeting, during which our Members shared their own lived experiences of racism and spoke about what we need to do next because the truth is, while speeches and protests are vital, they will never be enough.

We need greater accountability and transparency in police departments and reformed police practices so these events don't happen in the first place. We need to reform the criminal justice system that is still too short on justice and begin chipping away at the racial disparities that exist in healthcare, housing, education, and in the economy.

These issues will not be solved in a week or a month or in a year. Let's hope they can be solved in this decade. But I will be damned if we don't at least try to make some progress. Already, my colleagues Senators BOOKER, HARRIS, CARDIN, KLOBUCHAR, DUCKWORTH, SCHATZ, SMITH, and others are working with the Congressional Black Caucus in the House to develop legislation to address a number of issues related to police violence and racial justice. Senate Democrats will not wait to propose and push for bold, bold change.

Will our Republican colleagues join us? Leader MCCONNELL, commit to put a law enforcement reform bill on the floor of the Senate before July 4.

I have made this request for several days without an answer from the Republican leader. Even more disappointing, the Republican leader blocked a simple resolution I offered last night that reaffirmed Americans' constitutional rights to peaceful protest, condemned the violence that is occurring in too many places, and condemned the President as well for having gas and rubber bullets used on a peaceful protest in Lafayette Park, where there were families and children protesting in the grand American tradition of peaceful protest.

There was no partisan rhetoric in this resolution. It was three simple concepts, a recitation of the facts, but because Senate Republicans are so afraid—shivering—at the thought of criticizing the President, even when they know his actions are way out of line, Leader MCCONNELL came and blocked this resolution. Shame, shame, shame.

We all know there are very few checks on the President, especially a President who believes he can do anything he wants—and he said it. One of the most effective checks on President Trump could be the caucus of Republican Senators for once standing up to him when he is way out of line. Where are they? Where are they?

Even a columnist like George Will has shown a disgust at the Republican Senate, and he is a conservative, for their failure to stand up to Donald Trump on issues like this. All too often on thorny issues such as gun safety, racial justice, and police reform, my Republican colleagues sort of say what is necessary to get through the day, when there is an immediate crisis, and then wait for public attention to fade.

Leader MCCONNELL called us back into session in early May during the height of the COVID pandemic, but we still have not considered a single piece of legislation on the floor. Now listen to this. Yesterday, when Leader MCCONNELL was listing legislative priorities for June, he did not mention COVID legislation. Let me repeat for those who may have missed it in the swirl of news and events of the day. When listing his June priorities to reporters, Leader MCCONNELL did not mention COVID-related legislation. Other Republican Senators have said that another relief bill might come in late July—might, might.

This is shocking. This should be a wake-up call to the American people. Americans of all ages, races, creeds, and philosophies, call your Republican Senators. Demand action.

The recession will get deeper. It could develop into a depression if we don't have relief. We have not done enough in the eyes of every economist I have looked at and respected. Governors and mayors across the country in red States are slashing budgets in advance of the new fiscal year, which for most States starts July 1. States will be forced to cut millions of jobs and critical services. These cuts mean

increased school class sizes, longer emergency response times, fewer services to keep the elderly at home and out of nursing homes. These cuts not only exacerbate the recession but the wrath of the coronavirus itself. That is what is happening while Senate Republicans wait until July, maybe, to consider another relief bill.

America, look at what our Republicans are doing: not giving the relief you need for your safety, for your schools, for the services that local government provides.

The Republican majority doesn't seem to have time to address a cascading series of national crises—no time. Why is that?

Where is President Trump? Where is his Cabinet? They all know that we need more. They all know we haven't solved the economic problem—far from it. They all know that we have to do a lot more on testing.

So our Republican majority doesn't seem to have time to address the COVID national crisis, but do you know what it does have time for? Chasing President Trump's wild conspiracy theories. It sounds like the death knell of the Republican Party as we know it. They can't deal with the two major crises of the day—racial justice and the COVID crisis—and they are busy pursuing conspiracy theories, some of them emanating from Russia, to go after President Obama and Vice President Biden.

This makes no sense. This, again, sounds like the death knell of the Republican Party. The Republican Party we used to know would have some principles but not be afraid to run to every major issue—to any major issue almost. But that is what they are doing.

Today, in the Judiciary Committee, the Republican committee chairman has called in Rod Rosenstein to dredge up the President's favorite conspiracy theory related to the 2016 election. It is an egregious misuse of the institution—the Senate.

Nearly a quarter of our workforce is unemployed. Over 100,000 Americans are dead from a strange and contagious disease; Americans are in the streets demanding racial justice; and shopworn, discredited conspiracy theories are what the Republican majority is focused on? What alternative universe do they live in? What alternative reality are they in the midst of? One detached from the real reality that the American people face: conspiracy theories to help President Trump's reelection, rightwing judges, many of whom have antipathy to the civil rights we are talking about now.

The Republican Party in the Senate has moved so far into a corner, the corner that Donald Trump is in, that they can't address two of the most important and major issues that have affected this country in decades.

The American people should be furious with the Republican Senate majority, and the American people and historians will record with sadness how this

once great party, even though I didn't agree with it, has declined so—no courage, no principle, but simply cowering for President Trump and his crazy theories that even they know are crazy.

The American people, of course, should be furious with the President as well. On Monday night, Americans watched Federal officers, under the direction of the President and the Attorney General, use gas and rubber bullets to disperse a crowd of peaceful protesters in a public park so that the President could stage a photo op in front of a church, waving the Holy Bible as a prop.

Last night, Americans saw an even more haunting image on the internet and their televisions: rows of camouflage troops standing at attention on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, like an occupying force defending a critical position.

When you see the image of troops dressed for combat flanking the Lincoln Memorial, an altar of freedom, you cannot help but think of Tiananmen Square. This administration ordered Federal officers to gas peaceful protesters and charge on horseback and defend our monuments like battlefield positions.

What is President Trump doing to this grand democracy? What is he doing? And why are our Republican colleagues just going along?

President Lincoln's second inaugural address is engraved in that building where armed soldiers stood. During a moment of extreme political division and civil strife, President Lincoln urged malice toward none, charity toward all, and sought to bind up the Nation's wounds.

There could be no greater contrast between Lincoln and this President, this President who seems to have malice toward all and charity for none, who seeks to deepen our Nation's wounds rather than bind them up. Our Nation is crying out for leadership, for direction, for some healing and some unity. Will this President even try to provide it?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I want to speak here in just a moment to the issue of internet traffic and how that has been impacted by the coronavirus, how it has impacted our lives during the coronavirus. Before I do that, though, I want to just respond to a few things the Democratic leader mentioned.

He again pointed out that the Republican Senate isn't doing work here. It is hard to fathom how he can possibly come to that conclusion. The Democrat-run House of Representatives is out of session for the entire month—the entire month of June. They are not even here. The Democratic House of Representatives isn't even in town.

The Senate is here doing work, and important work, I might add. He said

we haven't passed any legislation. Well, the week before the Memorial Day break we passed the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act reauthorization, a critical piece of national security and intelligence legislation that all our intelligence experts tell us is critical to fighting the war against terrorists. Pretty important legislation, I would say.

He pointed out that the agenda for the month of June doesn't include much. Well, that is only if you don't think that the National Defense Authorization Act is not important. Funding the military, authorizing the weapons systems, paying the personnel, the technology, the intelligence, all the things that go into protecting the country seem to me to be pretty important.

So the National Defense Authorization Act is a piece of legislation that the Senate will process during the upcoming weeks here in the month of June. In fact, that will probably take a good week to move across the floor of the Senate. It typically does. It is something we have to do on an annual basis, but there is nothing more important and more critical to the national security of the United States than the National Defense Authorization Act.

We will be passing a major parks bill this next week, which will help fund the backlog in a lot of our national parks—something that has been a priority for many Democrats here in this Chamber for a long time. In fact, it is a great bipartisan bill. In fact, I think, out of the Democratic caucus, there are somewhere on the order of 43 of the 47 Democrats who are cosponsoring the piece of legislation that will be called up later this week and be on the floor most of next week.

So it is something that has been around here for a while. It is going to be a major legislative accomplishment. It will be a bipartisan accomplishment when it passes.

So I would just say that the fact that we aren't doing the things the Democratic leader wants to do doesn't mean the Senate isn't very busy. The things he wants to do, the things he talks about wanting to do, are things that we are doing. We are dealing with the coronavirus on a daily basis around here.

I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee. Yesterday, the Senate Finance Committee had a hearing in which officials from the FDA, for example, critical agencies when it comes particularly to pharmaceuticals in this country, attended, and the subject of the hearing was the pharmaceutical supply chain and what we need to do to shore that up, to make sure that in future pandemics, with lessons learned from this one, we aren't dependent upon unreliable supply chains in places around the world that, frankly, may not be dependable. That is a pretty important issue when it comes to dealing with the effects and the impacts of the coronavirus.

Today, in the Senate Commerce Committee, another committee on which I serve, we are going to be examining the impact of the coronavirus on our transportation infrastructure and how important this transportation has been throughout the course of the coronavirus in ensuring that we keep commerce going, that we keep food in the grocery stores.

We are going to be looking at both the highway aspect, the rail aspect—all of those—and how they are impacted by the coronavirus and what we might need to do to ensure that they continue to be able to provide the services that they do going forward.

So we are consistently looking at, on a daily basis, the coronavirus, the impact it is having on our economy, the impact it is having on the health of people in this country, the health emergency, and putting measures in place that would deal not only with that health emergency but also with the economic crisis created by it.

In the meantime, we are seeing the economy start to open up again, which I think is a very good thing. I am hopeful we will see, as the economy opens up, that people will get out, consumers will spend, investors will invest, and we will see that economy start to grow again, jobs to come back.

Obviously, we have very high unemployment right now—a major concern. We also have a major unemployment insurance piece of legislation that was moved by this Congress earlier to provide assistance and help for those who, through no fault of their own, have had to go on unemployment.

To suggest for a moment that we aren't focused on the coronavirus is completely missing the point—as is to suggest, also, that we haven't done a lot already. We passed four major pieces of legislation, totaling almost \$3 trillion, and that is \$3 trillion if you don't include the amount of leverage we gave to the Federal Reserve and the Treasury to extend credit and create liquidity out there. With the power of that leverage, it is somewhere on the order of about \$6 trillion in assistance that we have put out there through different legislative vehicles to the American people.

So you are seeing that translated into the Paycheck Protection Program, which is keeping people employed, keeping jobs in this country, keeping businesses functioning and operating. It has been a very successful program.

You are seeing it in the form of direct assistance to State and local governments. And \$150 billion has been put out there, much of which hasn't been spent, and that is on top of a lot of other assistance to State and local governments, which totals somewhere on the order of about \$500 billion. Almost half a trillion dollars, so far, sum total, has gone out to State and local governments.

Much of that, as I said, is in the pipeline, hasn't been spent yet. It can be

used, as the Treasury has pointed out, given the States' flexibility, for emergency personnel, first responders, police, all the things that the Senator from New York talked about. That is flexibility the States have now to be able to meet the needs that they have and to work with their local governments and meet the needs of the local governments.

So there is a lot of money in the pipeline, not to mention, of course, first and foremost, the money we put out there for investment in therapeutics, in vaccines, in diagnostic testing, and all the money that has gone out to hospitals and nursing home providers and long-term care facilities to help them get through this crisis in the form of direct assistance. So there is a lot of money in the pipeline—as I said, about \$2.9 trillion that has already been authorized, and I think about 40 percent, maybe, has been spent. So there is still a lot of assistance going out there.

My friend, the Democratic leader, would just want to put a whole bunch more money out there without knowing what the need is, and I think, at a time when we are already running a \$21 trillion—now \$25 trillion—debt, we ought to be very circumspect and pay attention to what is happening in our economy, what the needs are, what we need to keep the economy opening up and responding, what we continue to need to do to help people who are unemployed, what we continue to need to do to help families in this country who are struggling through this crisis.

But we ought to do that based on the need, not just somebody saying: Well, let's just throw a bunch more money out there and hope that it has an impact. We have done that. We have flooded the zone with dollars. There is a tremendous amount of resources out there right now, a lot of which has yet to be spent, and it strikes me, at least, that, in the eyes of most Americans, they would view it as pretty important, before we spend more tax money—all of which, I might add, is going to be borrowed money—that we see how what we have done already is working, if it has been effective and is having the desired impact.

There is so much going on around here dealing with the coronavirus, it just completely defies any sort of logic to what the Democratic leader suggested was happening here in the Senate.

He made one other comment, which I think I have to respond to. He said that the Senate is in the process—Republicans in the Senate are processing rightwing judges who have antipathy for the very civil rights issues that we are dealing with right now.

I don't know how you can make a statement like that. I don't know how you can ascribe motive or intent to judges. You don't know who these judges are.

We have a judge we are going to be processing here for the DC circuit. It is

a pretty important circuit in this country. He is the district judge from Kentucky. He has been rated as very “well qualified” by the American Bar Association. The American Bar Association isn’t a rightwing group at all. In fact, many on our side think they certainly drift the other direction. Yet they have said this judge is a well-qualified judge. Do you think they would be saying something like that about a judge who had antipathy for civil rights? I mean, that is just, I would say, a reckless and irresponsible statement unless you have something to back that up and support it.

So I just thought it would be important to respond to some of the things that the Democratic leader just said with respect to the agenda here in the Senate, which, as I pointed out earlier, is a very full one. If you compare it to the agenda of our colleagues in the Democrat-controlled House, which is zilch because they are not here for the entire month, it seems to me the Senate is getting a lot of work done.

5G

So, Madam President, what I came here to talk about—I came down to the floor a couple of weeks ago to talk about how the coronavirus is highlighting the importance of strong internet networks.

Despite the surge we have seen in internet traffic that the coronavirus has produced, with Americans using the internet for everything from work to school to family dinners, U.S. networks have held up tremendously well.

Americans have been able to enjoy the same speed and streaming quality that they typically enjoy, something that hasn’t happened in a lot of other countries, and that is a direct result of the United States’ light-touch approach to internet regulation, which has encouraged American companies to invest in the latest communications infrastructure and new technologies to make more efficient use of spectrum.

Our Nation is currently preparing for the widespread adoption of the next generation of internet technology—what is known as 5G. We need to make sure that our 5G networks will be as strong as our current networks, but we still have some work to do to get to that point.

I come down here frequently to the floor to discuss that work, which includes paving the way for the widespread installation of the small cells that are necessary for 5G networks, enhancing the availability of the mid-band spectrum that is necessary for 5G deployment, and investing in a 5G workforce.

But there is also another aspect we need to think about when it comes to 5G, which is sometimes not talked about as much, and that is network security. With its incredible speed and connectivity, 5G will usher in a new era of innovation: advances in medical care, the large-scale deployment of precision agriculture, safer transportation technologies. 5G will bring all of these things and more.

But like any new technology, 5G networks will present new risks and vulnerabilities. And because 5G will mean a vastly greater number of connected devices, the risks with 5G will be greater. That is the why a central part of deploying 5G networks has to be looking at how we can mitigate security risks.

We need to ensure that our component parts of our devices and, critically, the component parts of telecommunications networks, like cell towers and the small cells that will be required for 5G, are secure. A primary way to do that is by ensuring that 5G equipment comes from trusted vendors.

Currently, one of the biggest suppliers of 5G equipment worldwide is a Chinese company, Huawei, which is supported by the Chinese Government. China’s 2017 national intelligence law requires Chinese companies to support the Chinese Government’s intelligence activities. American security officials have raised concerns that much of Huawei’s equipment is built with back doors that give the Chinese Government access to global communications networks.

I don’t need to tell anyone that we should be wary of China’s motives and that China’s interests are frequently opposed to those of the United States.

China’s handling of the coronavirus is a striking current example of the Chinese Government’s prioritizing its own interests or pride over the public good. As a New York Times article noted in February, “The [Chinese] government’s initial handling of the epidemic allowed the virus to gain a tenacious hold. At critical moments, officials chose to put secrecy and order ahead of openly confronting the growing crisis to avoid political alarm and political embarrassment.”

Whether it was driven by the hubris of the Communist Party or merely the callous indifference the Communist state has for the well-being of its own citizens, China was not transparent about the grave danger of COVID-19. It failed to release accurate information about the nature and spread of the virus, and it took active steps to make sure the truth did not get out in other ways. Whistleblowers were punished; the centers were censored; and journalists were expelled.

Despite the fact that its negligence undoubtedly contributed to the global spread of COVID-19, China still continues to be less than forthcoming about the virus. Unfortunately, this is run-of-the-mill governing in China, as we saw with the SARS outbreak in the early 2000s and as we have seen in many other instances.

Not content with its role in aggravating the spread of the coronavirus, the Chinese Communist Party has also taken advantage of the pandemic to strip Hong Kong of its autonomy and freedom. China’s hope is that our Nation is too preoccupied with this pandemic to notice its efforts to undermine what should be Hong Kong’s autonomy under the one state, two systems construct.

We have noticed. As many of my colleagues and I have expressed, we stand with Hong Kong. We must carefully consider an appropriate response, one that will rebuke the Communist Party of China without negatively affecting the people of Hong Kong, their well-being, and their democratic aspirations.

We didn’t need COVID-19 or China’s recent actions in Hong Kong to know that giving the Chinese Government a backdoor into American communications networks is a bad idea. But it certainly underscores the need to make sure that 5G infrastructure is not made by companies beholden to the Chinese Government. The United States has taken a number of steps to prevent equipment from Huawei and another suspect Chinese company, ZTE, from being used in U.S. communications networks, but these companies still pose a risk to the United States.

For starters, some U.S. broadband providers, often in rural areas, still have equipment from Huawei and ZTE in their communications networks. A number of our allies and trade partners—entities with whom we regularly share information, including sensitive national security information—have used or are using technology from Huawei and ZTE.

What can we do? An initiative is already underway to replace suspect telecommunications components in U.S. networks with hardware from trusted companies.

In March, the President signed legislation developed by the Commerce Committee chairman, ROGER WICKER, the Secure and Trusted Communications Network Act, to help speed up this process. This legislation, which I cosponsored, will help small telecommunications providers with the cost of replacing network components that pose a security risk.

Also, in March, I introduced legislation to help address the other part of the problem, and that is the use of Huawei technology by our allies and our trading partners. We regularly exchange information, including sensitive national security information, with our allies and trading partners. And this information can only be secure if networks on both ends are secure. That is why the United States has called for other countries to reject telecommunications technology from Huawei and ZTE.

A number of countries have committed to using trusted companies to build out their telecommunications networks, but other countries are still planning to make use of Huawei’s technology. My legislation, the Network Security Trade Act, would make telecommunications security a key objective when negotiating future trade deals.

We should be using trade agreements to push for enhanced network security globally, which would benefit not only our country but every country with which we do business.

We recently opened negotiations on a new trade deal with the United Kingdom, which has been using Huawei technology to build its 5G networks. I am pleased that it now looks like the UK is reconsidering its use of Huawei components. I hope they will decide to reject the suspect technology.

I hope the trade negotiations will emphasize the importance of using trusted companies to build out the UK's telecommunications networks. The security of our communications with our trading partners and allies—particularly those allies like Britain—needs to be a priority.

As we move forward into the 5G future, we need to make sure that our technological advancements are matched with advancements and network security. That starts with keeping Huawei and other suspect technology out of our networks and, if at all possible, out of the networks of our allies.

I will continue to do everything I can to ensure that we have not only the infrastructure but the security needed to keep American networks at the forefront of the telecommunications revolution.

Before I close, let me just say one more word about China. As I said earlier, China's coronavirus deception is undoubtedly partly responsible for the fact that this virus has now spread to every corner of the world. China's recent actions with regard to Hong Kong underscore the hostility of the Chinese Government to the values that freedom-loving countries hold dear.

China has a lot of work to do if it ever hopes to rebuild trust with other nations. At a bare minimum, we expect China to uphold its recent trade commitments, which are critical to America's hard-hit farmers and ranchers. I will be looking, and our entire government will be looking, to see if China's word on trade agreements can be relied upon. I hope that the Chinese Government will live up to its commitments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the senior Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I note with some interest that one Republican colleague after another comes to the floor—their “protect the President at all costs” colleagues, no matter what he does, no matter what he says, no matter how he acts, no matter how incompetent, no matter how divisive—and continues to point their fingers at the Chinese for the coronavirus. God knows, China deserves heaps of blame for the outbreak in the early spread of the coronavirus. There is no question they deserve a lot of blame for the outbreak in the early spread, and they are

lying about it. But keep in mind that we are 5 percent of the world's population, and 30 percent of the deaths from the coronavirus have been Americans. This President continues to make excuses and point fingers. And the compliant, always obedient, sheeplike Members of the Republican caucus conference of the Senate continue to stay quiet, continue to do nothing about this President's behavior and the 105,000 deaths from coronavirus in this country.

PROTESTS

Mr. President, the protests around our State, throughout our country, are an expression of fear and grief and frustration and of anger. Black communities led the Nation in mourning the killings of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor over the last week. They are now leading calls for justice and long-term changes to dismantle the systems of oppression that hold them back.

Instead of listening to those calls from the people who built this country, instead of offering leadership and rising to meet this moment—as every one of his predecessors of both parties did in times of trouble for our country—President Trump fails yet again. Instead of uniting, he divides. Instead of comforting, he stokes fear. He points fingers. He places blame. Instead of healing, he rubs salt in the open wounds of Black Americans.

On Monday night, the President of the United States turned the arm of the state on peaceful protesters—we saw the video—tear-gassing the citizens he is supposed to serve, all so he could walk across the street and stage a photo op at a church he doesn't attend and hold up a Bible that he doesn't read. The timid—you choose the adjective—timid, cowardly, spineless Republican colleagues in this Senate just remained silent. How offended they would have been if a Democratic President had done what this President does and fails to do—the tear-gassing of citizens he is supposed to serve, the photo op at a church, the holding up of the Bible he doesn't read, the excuses, the divisiveness, all of that.

People are tired. People are angry: more Black sons and daughters and mothers and fathers killed by police officers—the very people who are supposed to protect all Americans; more death, when many are already grieving—so many in the Black community already grieving the loss of family members and friends for the coronavirus, grappling with the economic stress this pandemic has caused.

The pandemic has been the “great revealer.” We know Black and Brown communities have been hit hardest by the coronavirus. They are more likely to get sick. They have less access to healthcare. They make up the communities hurt by Jim Crow laws and redlining and now the locking in of those rules and regulations by the Trump administration. Black and Brown communities disproportionately make up our essential workers. It is not because

they don't work as hard. It is not because of individual choices. We all work hard. We are all trying to do something productive for our families and our communities. We all want to build a better country for our daughters and our sons. No; it is because of a racist system that is making it harder for their work to pay off and putting at risk their lives for generations, long before this virus appeared.

A grocery store worker in Cincinnati said to me: They tell me I am essential, but I feel expendable. I don't feel safe at work, and they don't pay me very much. I feel expendable.

Long before this pandemic, millions of Americans knew we had a system that treats them like they are expendable. Their hard work isn't paying off. For some, it feels like the system is broken. For Black and Brown workers, it never worked to begin with.

In the midst of the trauma and the grieving, millions of those same Americans still go to work day after day, week after week, in grocery stores, as delivery people, in drugstores, as bus drivers, and the people who do the linen and change the beds in hospitals, the food service workers, the custodians, the security people, the first responders. In the midst of the trauma and grieving, those same Americans—millions of them—still go to work day after day, week after week.

Our job is to show the victims of systemic racism at the hands of their own government that the same government can and will protect them from this pandemic. We hear them. We see them. We fight for them. Their lives matter.

Our response to this crisis must be to stand behind all the people who make this country work, all workers, whether you swipe a badge or punch a clock, whether you earn a salary or make tips, whether you are raising children or caring for an aging parent; all workers, whether your hard work isn't paying off now or whether it never paid off the way it should.

Dr. King said:

One day our society will come to respect the sanitation worker. For the person who picks up our garbage, in the final analysis, is as significant as the physician, for if he doesn't do his job, diseases are rampant. All labor has dignity.

It is Black and Brown workers who have too often, far too long, far too often been robbed of their dignity on the job. If we want to be a country where all people have dignity, we need to start by recognizing that all labor has dignity. But so far, our response to the crisis is not the response of a government that believes that. This Senate, this President, can always find trillions of dollars for corporations—for tax cuts, for bailouts. But when hard-working families need help with rent or to put food on the table, President Trump and Leader MCCONNELL say we can't afford it.

The President and the administration have already made racial and economic inequality worse and undone

civil rights protections. They have been pretty clear that they are willing to put American workers' lives at risk—to reopen stockyards or just to juice the stock market.

President Trump and his administration believe that millions of Americans are expendable. It is not a coincidence that many of the people they consider expendable are Black and Brown workers.

Since the President is unwilling to protect people—whether that is protecting their lives or protecting their financial future—we in the Senate must fill the leadership void. As we do that, we work for change. We need to be clear that part of leading is listening.

The best ideas don't come out of Washington—the solutions we need to fix the justice system, to address wealth inequality, to reverse disparities in healthcare, to help communities that have been hurt by redlining and Jim Crow laws and so much more.

Whenever we talk about this, whenever people bring up the ways the system has failed so many Americans on the Senate floor or at a protest march, there are always naysayers—almost always White, usually men, often pretty well-off—who say: How can you be so negative? Why do you want to dwell on all the worst parts of our history? Don't you love our country?

My response to our country's naysayers and sunshine patriots is this: How can you be so pessimistic as to believe that this is the best our country can do? Do you really think the American people, with our ingenuity and our optimism and tenacity—do you really think the American people can't create a fair economy and a more just government? Do you truly believe we can't have a society that works for everyone—Black and White and Brown, women and men—no matter who you are, no matter what kind of work you do? Protesting, working for change, organizing, demanding our country do better—those are some of the most patriotic things any of us can do.

I love my country. If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work, all of them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would remind Senators that under rule XIX, it is provided that “no Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.”

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I want to respond to the accusations that were made. And I worded that carefully not to violate any rules. I am going to do that.

I see kind of an active desperation that is creeping in on statements and things that are said about other people. And right now, we are experiencing some things that actually are a success.

I want to respond to some of the accusations that were made. First, I have something else to do that is kind of an awkward thing to be doing at this time because I am going to go back to talk about something that happened not yesterday or this week but back in 1983. I think it is important that we do this. About every 10 years I do this. And we are going to be successful now because I have a commitment from the President that he is going to stay hitched on an issue—a huge issue in the past.

In 1983, not much was known about Iran's efforts to train and arm the radical proxies and to kill Americans and to kill our partners and our allies. People know now. In fact, only a few years earlier, Ayatollah Khamenei led a violent revolution in Iran. Khamenei's regime introduced himself to the world by taking American diplomats hostage for 444 days—444 days. We all remember when that happened. That was something unprecedented. It was all tied into Khamenei. Of course, he used other people. Nothing has changed since that time.

Nonetheless, for the next decade, until his death in 1989, Khamenei was the ruthless face of an Iranian regime that applied a brutal version of religious law, murdered innocent people, suppressed religious and ethnic minorities, and supported radical Islamists.

He hated Western value, and he hated the freedoms that we enjoy. Almost 4 years into his rule as Supreme Leader, October 23, 1983, 241 Americans, both U.S. marines and other service personnel serving a peace mission in Beirut, were attacked at their barracks by a truck that was carrying 2,000 pounds of explosives by terrorists who were armed and trained by Iran. That was in 1983. Two hundred and forty-one died.

These terrorists later became what we know as Hezbollah. That is the first time they surfaced and were identified as they are today, as an arm of Iran. Hezbollah struck.

In 2003, 20 years after the attack on our marines, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia ruled in a civil suit brought by the families of the victims—the 241 who were killed—that Iran had used Hezbollah as a proxy to bomb the Marine barracks in Beirut on that October day.

Not much has changed with Iran, unfortunately. It is the same way they operate now. They don't play by the rules. They never have. They are terrorists. They are worse than terrorists. They are the ones who are training the terrorists. That became even more apparent when we began to learn more about their ties to Islamist terror organizations and how they use proxy organizations, with no true allegiance but on behalf of a twisted interpretation of Islamic religious text, to murder and then sneak back into the shadows. That is the way they operated, and that is the way they operate today.

It happened under Ayatollah Khamenei, and it happens under the

current Supreme Leader as well. Nothing has really changed. A lot of years have gone by. A lot of people have died.

As I speak here on the floor, Iran is providing weapons and cover for the Houthi rebels, who are committing unthinkable atrocities in Yemen. Iran has continued to support terrorist groups that threaten our personnel in Iraq. It has repeatedly attacked our partners across the region. What is even worse is Iran seeks a nuclear weapon capability, and President Obama's Iran deal would have, ultimately, let it have exactly what it wanted.

Fortunately, we now have a President who takes a strong stance against Iran with the imposing of sanctions and the pulling out of the flawed Iran nuclear deal that the previous administration put us in.

By the way, I had a joyful conversation for a half an hour yesterday with Netanyahu, the Prime Minister of Israel. He was reminding me that I was in Israel and in the Prime Minister's office at the very moment that President Trump pulled out of the Iran deal, and I had never seen him so jubilant. We just talked about that yesterday.

Go back now to October 23, 1983, when 241 Americans were killed by an Iranian-backed suicide bomber. It was a terrible day in U.S. history, and, in 2003, a U.S. court ruled that Iran was responsible. That suit against Iran, brought by the victims' families—the families of the 241 who died—provided punitive and compensatory relief in the form of Iranian assets. In 2007, the district court judge awarded just over \$2.5 billion to the families of those murdered in that atrocity.

Our work isn't done now. You would think that it would be, but it is not because there is nearly \$1.7 billion in laundered Iranian assets in a Luxembourg bank named Clear Street, and we need to make sure that it stays there. Yet I have this gnawing feeling that, once something is over in Luxembourg or someplace like that, all of a sudden, you wake up and find that Iran has \$1.7 billion it is not entitled to in order to spread terrorism throughout the world.

In last year's NDAA—now, the NDAA is the largest bill we do each year. I chair the defense authorization. It is called the National Defense Authorization Act. We pass it every year. We included language that made those assets available to the victims' families, and the President signed it. I talked to the President, and he is anxious to do this. We have one obstacle that we have to get past, which is some activity by the second circuit where it is now being played out.

President Trump has been a firm leader against the aggressive Iran, and I certainly stand with him. That is why this is a clear opportunity to continue President Trump's maximum pressure campaign against the current Iranian regime so as to ensure these assets do not return to Iran, where they would surely be used to help the proxy organization, such as Hezbollah.

I trust our Department of Justice with this, and I am glad we have a President who has made this a top priority—making sure the families of those 241 victims who were killed in Beirut receive this money as opposed to having the money go back.

PROTESTS

Mr. President, in responding to a couple of things that were said a few minutes ago, we all know this is a really trying time for our Nation. I begin with the obvious, which is what happened to George Floyd was a crime. It was a horrible crime, and it has caused a groundswell of people joining together and standing against injustice and hate, not just for George Floyd but for so many others.

Protests are meaningful and positive events—standing up for dignity and respect for all people. Protesting is a cherished part of our democratic society that is enshrined in the First Amendment. The rights of peaceful protest should be supported and celebrated, period. We understand that. Yet those protests are not the same as the dangerous, destructive activity we have seen in many of our cities just in the last couple of days. Emotions are high, and tensions are high, which is understandable. We need law and order if we are going to move forward, and I think every reasonable person agrees with that.

We are trying to have tough conversations about inequality, but we are facing a lot of misinformation, especially when it comes to our military. If we let this misinformation spread, it will just make things worse. All of the people out there—I am talking about the “hate Trump” people—are using this to try to lie to the American people. So I would like to correct the record, and I hope every American here understands and believes these words. This is very important. Here is what is happening.

Right now, the National Guard has not been federalized for response. Right now, Active-Duty troops have not been sent into any city, including DC. I was here last night. I was visibly looking around and making sure that this was not the case, and it was not. There were no Active-Duty troops in spite of things you have heard to the contrary.

Right now, local and State law enforcement are being supported by the National Guard but only when they are requested by their States. The Department of Defense believes that, and by and large, they are doing a fine job. I agree with that. Our military is prepared to step in if the situation deteriorates dramatically and only if our President finds he has to step in. To be crystal clear, the President hasn't done that yet.

I ask my fellow Americans to slow down and understand what will happen if and only if the President does so. It doesn't mean that our streets will immediately be flooded with uniformed and armed troops. There is a process that has to be followed just as it was in

1992 with the LA riots, in 1998 after Hurricane Hugo, and at every other time before that.

First, this is the process. What has to happen is the President must issue a proclamation ordering any insurgents to disperse within a set period of time. Now, that is really important because that is the warning shot. He says this is going to happen, but only you can keep this from happening. The President has to issue the proclamation ordering any insurgents to disperse within a set period of time. It will mean that our Nation's military and security leaders, including our Commander in Chief—the President—will have determined that the situation will have deteriorated in a way that local officials will not have managed on their own. In virtually every case, local officials have agreed with that.

We are not there now. We are not there at all, and I hope we don't get there. This will only be as a last resort. If we do, I am confident this decision will be made with the advice of the top civilian and military officials who have all been confirmed with wide bipartisan support and margins.

GENERAL MARK A. MILLEY

Mr. President, I would like to say a little something about simple military relations. This is something I care a lot about as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. In particular, I want to speak about General Milley.

General Milley is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In this job, General Milley is the President's top military adviser. Don't forget he doesn't have any command authority over the military forces. This is important. This is not what you hear people talking about when they misrepresent the situation. This is very important. He is there as the adviser to the President of the United States, and he doesn't have any command authority. There has been a lot of criticism about his wearing his battle dress uniform—his BDU, as they call it—on Monday when the President spoke. Here is another area in which I want to set the record straight.

General Milley was getting ready to visit with troops around DC—I know that. I was talking to him that day—who were also in their BDUs. That was the dress uniform for their function at that time. Then he was called to the White House. We all know why he was called to the White House. He is the adviser to the President. I think everyone can agree that we want that voice at the table in situations like this to provide the best military advice, as is his statutory authority and responsibility.

On Monday, after General Milley walked outside with the President, he assessed the situation and immediately removed himself. Now, this isn't just me talking. I know that he did because I was with him shortly before that and also after that. So that was a fact. He also told me that he intended to honor his oath and uphold the delicate bal-

ance between civilians and the military. I fully believe him. He has always done that in the past and always will do that.

The accusations against General Milley are especially troubling to me because I know, from working with him, of his commitment to our Nation, to the Constitution, and to the American people—of keeping them safe and giving his best military advice. It is striking below the belt to make these accusations and to try to scare the American people. It is my duty as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to have strong oversight over this issue. We have oversight over it. If what they are saying is true, we still have the oversight.

I assure you, right now, we are watching what our military is doing and what it has always done, which is its duty within the law and constitutional limits, and that is exactly what General Milley has done and is doing right now. We are seeing a lot of finger-pointing and blame going around. We owe it to ourselves and our neighbors to believe the very best in each other, not assume the worse. We need to recognize everyone's inherent value and dignity and treat each other with respect and dignity as Christ calls us to do. Only then can we listen with both of our ears and with our hearts. That is what I am asking the American people to do.

Many of those in the protests are in a group that has been referred to as antifa. Certainly, George Floyd's death was a tragedy and went beyond unthinkable dimensions, but did any of them know who he was? I suggest, no, they really didn't. So I would only say this: I think, in answer to the accusations that were made, that I would quote only one or two sentences out of a speech that our President made 2 days ago in the Rose Garden. This is very self-explanatory and does explain the situation in response to the accusations that have been made falsely about him.

We cannot allow the righteous cries and peaceful protesters to be drowned out by an angry mob. The biggest victims of the rioting are peace-loving citizens in our poorest communities. And as their President, I will fight to keep them safe. I will fight to protect you. I am your President of law and order and an ally of all peaceful protesters.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I first thank my friend, Senator LEAHY, for allowing me to speak, for we are all dealing with the Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEAHY be recognized as soon as I finish my brief remarks.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I want to say just a couple of things to Tennesseans and to Americans.

All are expressing their rage and grief over the murder of George Floyd

in Minnesota. I will tell you that this event of May 25 cannot be written off as a simple use of force or as being unfortunate or regrettable. We all know that, on that day, George Floyd was killed by a police officer while other officers looked on and heard his begging for life and his cries for help. The officers responsible should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

I offer my prayers and condolences to the Floyd family, just as so many other Members of this Chamber have done, and I support the President's call for the Justice Department to investigate this death.

CENSORSHIP

Mr. President, our country was built on the premise of dissent, and we have seen the power that peaceful protests have in their ability to bring change to every level of government. Unfortunately, over the past week, we have also seen what happens when criminals and shadowy professionals exploit these public expressions of frustration and pain.

Every single day, Americans are waking up to find that their neighborhoods have been destroyed, and they watch news reports that are dominated by lawlessness. Many activists and members of the mainstream media have attempted to force us into choosing between solidarity and maintaining law and order. This is a false choice. It is one that we ought to reject. Instead, we should fight for accountability, compassion, and understanding. At the same time, we must condemn racism, hatred, and the violence that has torn apart so many neighborhoods this very week.

We should also celebrate and defend our right to peaceful disagreement in the streets, in the classroom, and online just as well as in this very Chamber. Unfortunately, too often, this right is not celebrated. Over the years, we have documented Big Tech's history of censorship, particularly the censorship of dissenting conservative voices. During the 2018 election cycle, a series of pro-life ads that I sponsored on social media were taken down for having content the platform labeled as "inflammatory."

For years, conservatives have been fighting a losing war against content moderation policies that act as a drag-net for dissenting opinions. Last week, Twitter rolled out a new "fact-checking" feature and almost immediately botched a fact check on one of President Trump's tweets. Unfortunately, for Twitter, the President was not afraid to point out how easy it is for private companies to make mistakes that turn moderation into speech policing. We know that social media companies have subjectively manipulated their algorithms to capture conservative opinions and conservative elected officials. They have been doing this for too long for it to just be a mere mistake. These are not unintended consequences.

Last week, President Trump signed an Executive order to bring some much

needed attention to the issue, and we thank him for that. As head of the Judiciary Committee's Tech Task Force, I look forward to working with the White House and the Justice Department to preserve free speech online for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

PROTESTS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we know that America is hurting. It is reeling from a deadly pandemic that has taken more than 100,000 lives and then from witnessing the broad daylight murder—murder—of yet another Black man by an officer of the law. It seethes with rage and sorrow about the racial injustices that still plague our society. America is suffering from unprecedented political divisions that are routinely worsened and deepened by a President whose every utterance only tears us further apart. In my decades in the U.S. Senate, I have never seen our country so in need of healing.

I was a prosecutor. So, when I first saw the video of George Floyd's murder—a human being who was pinned down by the neck, cried "I can't breathe," and desperately called out for his mother—I was shocked to my core. For millions of Americans and for me, that shock swiftly turned into anger.

How could a police officer, who has sworn an oath to protect and serve, so casually take a human being's life? Why did his fellow officers who witnessed the murder that we all witnessed on video stand there and do nothing to stop it? How could this happen in plain sight when multiple on-lookers begged the officer to relent—stop his murderous conduct—as George fell unconscious?

I was left sickened and shaken.

I do not know and did not know George Floyd, but imagine if he were your neighbor or your friend. Imagine if George Floyd were your brother, your son, your husband, or your grandchild. Imagine if George Floyd simply looked like your loved one and shared the same skin color. Imagine the concern you would have for such a person who lived in constant fear of those who are responsible to protect us all. So it is no surprise that protests swept our Nation in the wake of this murder. Communities of color and all those who sympathize with them are fed up. They are sick and tired of the fact that African Americans are nearly 2½ times as likely as White Americans to be killed by police officers. No one of good conscience can sit idly by while African-American lives are treated with less worth. Our country long ago promised equal rights and equal justice.

Now protesters are aching for real accountability for officers of the law who engage in lawless violence. It is not simply justice for George Floyd; it is justice for Eric Garner, Michael Brown, Tamir Rice. The list goes on and on, which is why the protests go on and on.

Too often, people feel the police officers who take Black lives are treated like they are above the law. They feel the justice system has been fueled by a culture of impunity that shields the same officers who abuse the public's trust. Too often the accountability comes after incontrovertible evidence, such as a damning video, happens to surface and the public demands justice.

I can say, as one who served proudly in law enforcement and has served proudly in the Senate, ultimately accountability will require dismantling this culture of impunity, as well as ensuring that law enforcement agencies have training and policies in place to serve to rebuild trust in communities of color.

The protesters demand more from our justice system. They demand more from a nation that promises that nobody is above the law. Well, I stand with them, and Congress has to, too. None of us condone, and indeed I have strongly condemned, the looting and violence that has sadly taken place alongside the peaceful protests and the extremists and opportunists who have co-opted the peaceful process. They are not serving justice. They are not going to bring the change our country so badly needs.

My hero, a dear friend who has called me his brother, Representative JOHN LEWIS, said just a few days ago:

[L]ooting and burning is not the way. Organize. Demonstrate. Sit-in. Stand-up. Vote. Be constructive, not destructive.

I hope everybody will listen to what Representative LEWIS said. I hope our fellow Americans will heed his wise words. I refuse to partake in efforts seeking to delegitimize all protesters and create even more distrust and division. Demonstrators demanding accountability are not thugs, as President Trump has called them. No one should threaten state-sanctioned violence against protesters, as this President and some of his allies have. I strongly oppose any efforts to invoke the Insurrection Act to unleash our military against these domestic demonstrations, as President Trump has absurdly threatened.

Our military is one of our Nation's most sacred institutions. It serves to safeguard our constitutional rights against enemies abroad. They should never be ordered to American streets as the battlefield, which would only incite further chaos and deprive Americans of their right to peacefully assemble. That is not the America we know and love. It is not the America I know and love.

Unfortunately, President Trump has proven that he is incapable or perhaps he is uninterested in healing and uniting our Nation. At every turn his instinct is to divide and escalate. During every crisis he manages to manufacture another of his own making. When Americans are in desperate need of a consoler in chief, a role that I have seen every past President play during my years in the Senate—every one of

those Presidents, Republican and Democrat alike—President Trump, instead of being consoler in chief, shows that he knows only how to be instigator in chief. He has revealed himself really to be a President of his country in name only. I never imagined I would say that of any American President of either party, certainly not of all the predecessors I have had the honor to know.

So we must instead look to ourselves and each other. How do we heal our country? At the local, State, and national levels, we must carry on the cause of criminal justice and police reform. We must push for systematic law enforcement reform. We must elect leaders who will prioritize racial justice and work tirelessly to achieve some measure of that. We must work to build bridges in communities so that we better empathize with the struggles faced by those who have been marginalized for decades on end.

On Monday, Terrence Floyd, George's brother, stood on the spot where his brother died. He made an emotional appeal to the hundreds of people watching and to the Nation. He pled for the protests to remain peaceful. He pled for those who believe they are marginalized and disenfranchised not to give up hope, that their voice matters, and he pled for justice.

His brother died because he needed a breath. His family now asks to take a breath for justice, a breath for peace, a breath for our country, and a breath for George. We should honor his memory by heeding their anguished advice.

There is so much to do. Congress must get to work. During my years in the Senate, I have seen America in crisis. But every time, without exception, I have seen America emerge a more just and stronger nation. The crises America faces today feel overwhelming, historic—some would say existential. But if we stay true to the values that define our Republic—equality, justice, the rule of law—I am hopeful we will make it through as a slightly more perfect union.

I weep for our country; I pray for our country; and I look for better days.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL PACK

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this week our majority leader is asking the Senate to vote on the nomination of Michael Pack to serve as Chief Executive of the U.S. Agency for Global Media.

Mr. Pack's nomination should trouble all of us in this Chamber. It raises the question of whether the U.S. Senate is committed to being the check and balance on the qualifications of those potentially vested with substantial responsibility into positions in our executive branch.

His nomination draws into question the challenge we have, the responsibility we have to ensure that only individuals of talent, experience, and of integrity serve America in the executive

branch. Hamilton commented on this in the Federalist Papers. He said:

To what purpose then require the co-operation of the Senate? I answer, that the necessity of [the Senate's] concurrence would have a powerful though, in general, silent operation. It would be an excellent check upon the spirit of favoritism in the President, and tend greatly to prevent the appointment of unfit characters.

Those words should resonate in this Chamber now. The individual who will come before us, Michael Pack, set up a nonprofit called Public Media Lab, or PML, apparently for the sole purpose to channel contracts to his for-profit operation known as Manifold Productions. Over a period exceeding a decade, he channeled \$4 million from the nonprofit to the for-profit. Not a single contract went anywhere else—no other contracts.

Utilizing a nonprofit to launder for-profit contracts, in the process of which providing tax subsidies to your customers and advantage over your competitors, raises both ethical and legal issues. The legal issues, including potential criminal conduct, have not been resolved. Mr. Pack is, at this moment, under investigation by the attorney general of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Pack, in tax filings to the IRS in 2011 through 2018, did not accurately disclose a relationship between his nonprofit and his for-profit. When he was asked if, in fact, there were common officers between the two, he answered no when the answer was clearly yes. He did not disclose that his for-profit benefited from the setup of the nonprofit.

Mr. Pack did admit to the Committee on Foreign Relations that he made oversights; that is the term he used—"oversights." But he has refused to correct his tax filings.

Mr. Pack, when he was renominated in 2020, inaccurately stated in the records to the committee that his tax returns were complete and accurate. He has refused to provide critical documents to the committee and, in that sense, to the Senate to examine these significant issues. He has refused to provide the agreements between PML and Manifold, his nonprofit and his for-profit, to examine the propriety of the relationship. He has said simply that those documents are confidential and proprietary.

But we should realize that serving in the executive branch is a privilege. We asked for information so that we can exercise our constitutional responsibility. When an individual confronted with substantial ethical and legal issues simply says "I will not provide them" and if the Senate committee says "That is OK," then we are failing in our constitutional responsibility to examine the qualifications of the individual. This is no light responsibility we bear in this Chamber. This is a very significant check and balance of the U.S. Constitution, which each and every one of us swore to uphold when we took our oath of office.

Mr. Pack, when he was president of the Claremont Institute, directed significant funds to his for-profit company for fundraising. His company is not a fundraising company; his company is a film company. So we have asked him to provide the details and documents related to that work to see if there was an inappropriate transfer of funds from a position of responsibility to the personal profit of Michael Pack. But Mr. Pack has refused to provide details. He has refused to provide documents related to that work.

In addition, he prematurely resigned from his role at the Claremont Institute, and it is shrouded in mystery. We do not know if the board found ethical issues. We do not know if they found criminal conduct because he has not responded to our request for documents related to his premature resignation.

Given the gravity of these issues, it makes sense, when he was renominated, that he would reappear before the committee to help clear up these concerns and these issues. Well, we have not had such a hearing.

To summarize, when an individual makes false statements to the IRS and refuses to correct them, when they make false statements to the committee, not in the first time before the committee but the second time before the committee, when they refuse to provide relevant documents to provide significant issues of ethical conduct or potential criminal conduct, when there is an active investigation into that potentially criminal conduct, then we should simply say to the President: Send us a different name.

This man may be well qualified, but he does not wish to provide the information necessary for the Senate to do its responsibility as a check and balance on potentially unfit individuals. To exercise advice and consent in accordance with responsibilities charged to us, we must insist on upholding the standards for records and documents and truthfulness to the committee. We must insist that outstanding investigations be completed when they involve potentially criminal conduct. We must insist that verifiably false statements be corrected. These are not high or exceptional standards; these are fundamental, basic, elementary responsibilities that we carry.

That is why I have written a resolution declaring that the Senate should not vote on a nominee who has made verifiably false statements to Congress or the executive branch and who refuses to correct those statements. Until those statements to both the Foreign Relations Committee and to the IRS are corrected, Michael Pack's nomination should be set aside. We should simply tell the President and exercise our responsibility, for which we have taken an oath of office, to send us someone else. This individual is not prepared to provide the information necessary for the Senate to proceed with his nomination. That is what we should be saying, and we should still be

saying it at this late date. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing by supporting this resolution.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 604

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 604, which was submitted earlier today. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what you are seeing here today is a pure, unadulterated exercise in politics—politics that are steeped with the difference of political philosophy between the two parties.

With relation to the complaint that my colleague has just made that this nomination hasn't been adequately vetted, this nomination was made 2 years ago tomorrow, June 4, 2018.

Mr. Pack came before the committee. He has been before the committee twice. He has produced numerous documents due to the complaints of the Democrats on the committee. He has been looked at by the White House. His business dealings have been looked at by the Justice Department, by the Internal Revenue Service, and he has been cleared of anything.

The U.S. Agency for Global Media is an important agency because it is charged with supporting international broadcasting outlets around the world in the face of the kinds of misinformation and things that are put out by other countries that are untrue.

The real reason for the objection to Mr. Pack's nomination is that this man is a patriot. This is a man who makes documentary films that portray the greatness of America.

Anyone who disagrees with that ought to spend the time to look at the documentary he just made, which was run on public TV within the last 30 days, regarding Clarence Thomas and what he had to go through to get on the Supreme Court. It was a superb representation of what happened in that. If you watch that, you will see why the Democrats are absolutely opposed to Mr. Pack.

But don't take our word for this. RealClearPolitics, after this whole thing started, did its own investigation into this, and they noted that the business arrangements of Mr. Pack used to make these documentaries are very common for documentary filmmakers and, like Pack, filmmakers and television producers also use nonprofits to collect contributions from donors and then set up a for-profit company to make these films. This is exactly what Senator MERKLEY was objecting to.

Having said that, they went on to interview others, including attorneys and everything else. Another producer

with no business ties to Pack told RealClearPolitics "that he set up the same two-pronged way of funding films last year on the advice of counsel, who told him it was standard operating procedure."

This has been looked at. It has been reviewed. Look, the committee has had this in its hands for almost 2 years. I have been really patient. Every time that I set this for a hearing and they wanted more time, I let that go.

Finally, the last time, I was really, really disappointed in the Democrats' engagement of the political system, enjoining it with the potential criminal justice system, to try to stop this.

The night before the business meeting, I got a letter from the attorney general for the District of Columbia—obviously a partisan individual—that says that he is going to look at this and, therefore, he is investigating it. The Democrats then said: Well, we can't go ahead with this because he is being investigated by this partisan person from DC.

Look, I am on the Ethics Committee. There are six of us. Half of us sit on the Foreign Relations Committee. In every instance I can think of on the Ethics Committee where the U.S. Justice Department has asked us to stand down because they were doing a legitimate criminal investigation, we have done so.

In this particular case, it was a partisan agency of the District of Columbia that noticed that they were going to do this investigation.

I started my career as a prosecutor. I have always felt that the justice system and the prosecuting system should be above politics, but to get a partisan individual to send a letter—after 2 years—on the eve of the business meeting, that he was going to open a business meeting again, after many delays, was just too much.

But I did delay the business meeting for 1 week, and after that 1 week we had a business meeting. The Democrats made motion after motion to delay. Again, I was as patient as I could be.

I said during these motions that we were only going to go on so long with this. Finally, as was noted by some of the attorneys in the room, had this occurrence happened in a court of law, the attorneys would have been held in contempt of court for making repetitive delay motions and done spuriously.

So, after the eighth motion, I declared the motions out of order, and we went to what democracies do. We went to a vote. To no one's surprise, it was a straight party-line vote: 12 votes to send Mr. Pack's confirmation to the floor for confirmation and 10 votes against that.

This is a democracy. The way we do this is we have disagreements, particularly when it comes to political matters such as this, but to try to engage the justice system in this I find just really, really disheartening.

We are going to have a vote on Mr. Pack, and it is very simple. If you

don't want Mr. Pack to take this job, then you vote no, and if you do, then you say yes. But this has been investigated back and forth. Regardless of the breast-beating and the rending of garments over what an awful person he is and how awful his businesses have been, keep in mind, this is all politics. If you see the kind of work that he has done, he makes America proud when he makes a documentary.

So I would object to the resolution that has been proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask to speak for up to 5 minutes before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I want to, first of all, thank Senator MERKLEY for his leadership on the resolution and for his thoughtful and substantive contributions as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to express our deep disappointment that our Republican colleagues are blocking his resolution, which basically says that we should not move forward on a nominee—in this case, this nominee—when there are false statements to the IRS and to the Foreign Relations Committee for which he refuses to correct the record, which would have consequences. Those are indisputable.

It is abundantly clear that we need to formalize some standards that apply equally to all nominees, Democrat and Republican alike, and we should think of it as a floor beneath which the Senate should not fall.

Now, it is amazing to me that I know my Republican colleagues used to care about tax issues. As a matter of fact, they denied a previous distinguished majority leader of the Senate—on some arcane issue—the opportunity to become the Secretary of Health and Human Services. They have done it a bunch of times.

This issue is a \$4 million tax issue in which Mr. Pack took his nonprofit, totally controlled by him—totally controlled by him—and had all the moneys that were solicited to the nonprofit then sent to his for-profit company, totally controlled by him—totally controlled by him. And no other disbursements were made from the nonprofit for anyone else, for any other entity.

I didn't hear until now that the Justice Department and the IRS has reviewed this. It should be forthcoming, then, that they have cleared this, that this is now in the course of business. We can create a nonprofit; go ahead and get moneys from people; they will get their deductions; and then we can send it to ourselves for profit. That is one heck of a process.

Now, the chairman continues to say "2 years." Well, 2 years ago there was a Republican chairman of the committee—our colleague Bob Corker. He

did not move this nomination 2 years ago. So with this constant refrain of 2 years, I guess you want to blame former Senator Corker for not moving it during that period of time.

At the chairman's request, I met with Mr. Pack. While he may not have been my nominee, I agreed to have a hearing, which is one of the standards we have in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There is an agreement between the chair and ranking. That has been violated for Mr. Pack. He actually went to a vote before the committee without my agreement, so that comity has been violated for the future.

At the end of the day, we have someone who will not ultimately—he says: Yes, I made a “mistake”—it is a \$4 million mistake—and, yes, I should have answered differently.

Well, why not correct it? If it is so simple, if it is so benign, why not correct it? The reason you don't want to correct it is that there are consequences that flow from that correction, including probably an IRS investigation.

Finally, it is interesting that, I guess, when Attorney General Barr does something, it is not political, but when the attorney general of the District of Columbia does it, it is political. I didn't know we were going to start choosing and picking which law enforcement entities are political in this country.

The attorney general of the District of Columbia had an investigation that was preceding before any action of the committee—preceding before any action of the committee or any information brought to the attention of the attorney general. Evidently, he considers it significantly serious enough—potential IRS violations on taxes.

So here are our Republican colleagues who, in the past, railed against anyone who had violations of the IRS Tax Code, saying they are not worthy of being a nominee, to going ahead and ramming through someone who ultimately has some serious issues to the tune of \$4 million, and that is not a problem. Under investigation—that is not a problem.

So I urge my colleagues to consider what you are doing here. Not only was a precedent set at the committee, but you will set a precedent on the floor, and it will be very hard for you to get up and rail about somebody's tax liabilities and what they did and didn't do honestly with the taxes at the end of the day.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close

debate on the nomination of James H. Anderson, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Jerry Moran, Rob Portman, Michael B. Enzi, Deb Fischer, Kevin Cramer, John Thune, John Boozman, Shelley Moore Capito, Marco Rubio, Todd Young, John Barrasso, James Lankford, Tim Scott, James E. Risch, Cindy Hyde-Smith.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of James H. Anderson, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 108 Ex.] YEAS—74

Alexander	Feinstein	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Peters
Bennet	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Reed
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hassan	Roberts
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Brown	Hirono	Rosen
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Casey	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Coons	King	Sinema
Cornyn	Lankford	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—18

Baldwin	Harris	Murray
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Udall
Cantwell	Leahy	Van Hollen
Cardin	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Cramer	Rounds	Smith
Hoeben	Sanders	Tester
Markey	Schatz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 74, the nays are 18.

The motion is agreed to.
The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I came to the floor of the Senate to ask for consent on the simple, timely Senate resolution sponsored by nearly half of the Members of this Chamber. What did the resolution call for? Well, it urged the United States to join global coronavirus vaccine and treatment efforts. That doesn't sound like a radical idea, does it? In the midst of a global pandemic that is causing so much suffering and so many deaths, it would seem that asking the United States to join other countries of the world in searching for therapies and vaccines is just common sense.

We don't know where or when a vaccine will be discovered. We don't know if an effective treatment will be discovered in the United States or in some other place. Certainly, with the respected medical and scientific leadership in the United States, you would hope that it would be here, but let's be honest. If a safe and effective vaccine against the coronavirus is discovered in some other country, the United States would want to be there and be part of the discussion about its production and distribution. Wouldn't we? That is all this resolution says.

Why not team up with allies around the world since we are all looking for the same thing—a safe and effective vaccine. Whether that vaccine is stamped “Made in the USA” or is made in some other country is secondary. Is it safe? Is it effective? Will it save lives? Do we really want the American people to be left out of such an effort? It was a global effort to eliminate smallpox, Ebola, polio, and so many other deadly diseases we took for granted. We were all in it together.

These viruses and diseases don't know any boundaries. People around the world have the same fears and concerns that we have in the United States about what we are paying in price of suffering and death until we find a way to avoid it. This resolution would just call on the United States to be part of a global effort to find a therapy and a vaccine, but this resolution was blocked here in the Senate. Since then, since the 2 weeks that have passed, we have lost over 100,000 American lives. Sadly, the number still grows. This has been 100,000 lives in just a few months—the same number of American casualties in the wars of Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan combined.

What was President Trump's response? Was there empathy or a message of national unity or healing during this tragic moment? No. Once again, President Trump refused to take any responsibility for leadership during this crisis. Sadly, he has cast blame in every direction and ignored his own responsibility amid a deadly global pandemic that has had devastating consequences for the American people.

Sadly, we lead the world in infections and death, but President Trump has decided that now is the moment in history for the United States to pull out of the World Health Organization—the same body that is heading the global pandemic response. What is he thinking—that we would walk away from the organization that has called to the table countries from around the world in an effort to find a safe and effective vaccine? Here we are, on the 40th anniversary of the World Health Organization's historic achievement in eradicating smallpox, stumbling along with a President who is more interested in settling a score, casting blame, and finding ways to divide us. Once again, the majority of his party here in the Senate is not chiming in and joining us in this effort to pass this resolution.

While we continue to have some of the world's best researchers and experts, it is plausible that a vaccine will be found and developed elsewhere. In a rush to research and validate a vaccine, ramp up production, address global allocation and supply needs, ensure affordability and access worldwide, and make sure the United States gets its fair share of any safe and effective vaccine, where will we stand if the President insists on being on the sidelines, unengaged? When the United States pursues this Trump go-it-alone approach while the rest of the world is working together, where does that leave us? Pride cometh before the fall.

Just as with the smallpox effort, a global, collaborative approach makes obvious sense, and it will save American lives. Joining forces with other countries around the world will help to speed the development and eventual distribution of the coronavirus vaccine we desperately seek.

Do you want to know what one Republican Senator from Tennessee said about this? He said: "I disagree with the President's decision."

Withdrawing U.S. membership from the WHO could, among other things, interfere with clinical trials that are essential to the development of a vaccine. No one knows where this vaccine will eventually be perfected or produced. God willing, it will be soon. Yet why shouldn't we be joining in this global effort? Why? Why, at this moment in history, has President Trump said we are stepping away from the organization that leads this effort?

Given this President's—sadly, I hate to use the word—"obsession" with blaming everyone but himself for mishandling this situation, maybe his dereliction of duty should come as no surprise, but what a bitter, bitter disappointment it is.

I return to the floor to ask unanimous consent on a straightforward resolution—a simple resolution that should have passed without any fanfare by a voice vote unanimously in the Senate. This resolution calls on the United States to join in the global effort to find a safe and effective vaccine—something that we have done

consistently throughout our history until this President took office.

Ultimately, let's remember that this is a pandemic that affects the world, and any solution has to be a worldwide solution as well. We cannot isolate ourselves from the international ways of finding treatments and the development of a vaccine. Doing so not only wastes time but risks there being a loss of life.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 579

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 579, a resolution encouraging the international community to remain committed to collaboration and coordination to mitigate and prevent the further spread of COVID-19 and urging renewed United States leadership and participation in any global efforts on therapeutics and vaccine development and delivery to address COVID-19 and prevent further deaths; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The Senator from Idaho.

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

First of all, let me commend my good friend from Illinois for bringing this. I know he is frustrated, as all of us are, with what has happened with this pandemic that came out of China and swept the world and caused all the grief that it has for America and for every other country on the planet.

It is important to note, I think, as we start, that the United States has been the single most generous donor of global health assistance around the world. We do hear people, from time to time, criticize the foreign assistance that America gives out. Probably the pandemic that we have just gone through, with this COVID-19 from China, is the best indication that there is for why certain foreign assistance is so crucial. This foreign assistance we give in the healthcare area is given, amongst other reasons, to keep those things from spreading to the United States.

Last year alone, we, the United States of America, we American taxpayers, provided over \$9 billion in global health assistance through the State Department and USAID. That \$9 billion does not account for the amount that the CDC spent in global health efforts. So it is well over \$9 billion that we Americans have put out there.

We strengthen health systems; we train health workers; we build supply chains; we connect health networks; we support cutting-edge research and innovation; and, yes, develop and expand access to therapeutics and vaccines, which is what my good friend from Illinois is addressing here when it comes

to vaccines. I am going to talk about that in a minute.

We led the international efforts to combat AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, polio, Ebola, and other viruses that came out of China. We are the single largest donor to the Global Fund and U.N. agencies, including UNICEF.

I hope that there isn't a suggestion that we are withdrawing from collaborative efforts to develop a COVID-19 vaccine because we did not directly participate in the EU pledging conference. In reality, leading partners in that effort include the Global Fund and Gavi, where we are the major donors, so we will be participating in the collaborative effort to develop vaccines for COVID-19.

I think it is also important to note that the President has made a historic—a historic 3-year pledge and is strongly supporting Gavi's COVID-19 efforts. Gavi stands for the global alliance for vaccines. It was essentially the brainchild of Bill Gates. He and Melinda, of course, in my judgment, are on an equal level with Mother Teresa for what they have done with global health. We are participating with Gavi and, like I said, the President has made a historic 3-year pledge to that.

I appreciate the feelings the good Senator from Illinois has about the President of the United States, and he did indeed put the brakes on WHO because he felt there were shortcomings with WHO when it came to WHO's work with China and their failure really to get after China at the very beginning of this to do what it really should have done.

I am going to object to this resolution not because the effort by the good Senator from Illinois isn't well-taken. It is well-taken. We had a similar one 2 weeks ago and they came out here and objected to it and the Senator is frustrated because he feels we should be doing more.

First of all, during the 2 weeks—were obviously gone for 1 week—but let me tell you what was going on during that week and the subsequent week. I promised, at that time, that the Foreign Relations Committee was going to take this issue on because it is of such importance that we don't go through this again, and there is a lot more that we can do than simply pass a resolution.

It is my ambition to create a very significant piece of legislation that will be bipartisan, that creates a vehicle to address a fast-moving virus like this. We can all argue about the WHO and what they did or didn't do, their connections to China and that sort of thing, but that is not going to help us as we go forward. What we do know is that WHO has done good work in the past. They were a really good partner with us, as the Senator knows, when it came to implementing PEPFAR and doing great things in the battle against AIDS. They were very helpful with Ebola and very helpful with smallpox, but this was a different virus. This was

a house on fire. WHO is simply not, at this time, geared to be a fireman. When the fire bell rings, we need a vehicle to address a virus.

This is going to happen again because in the Wuhan district, there is a vast bat population, and they are carrying about 2,000 different species of virus. Unfortunately, and frighteningly, we don't know what all those viruses can do. Heaven help us if we get one out of there that is worse than COVID-19 that we have had, but we need a fire department that can address this.

I hope we are going to be able to engage China. If not, we are going to have to find ways of dealing with this. Where is that vehicle going to be carried? Is it going to be a new part of WHO? Is it going to be part of the CDC? Is it going to be a new international organization? I can't answer that, but I can tell you this. On a bipartisan basis, Senator MURPHY, who is also on the Foreign Relations Committee, and I have introduced a bill to address a number of these things, including the vaccine question and including working on getting a vehicle to do what I have described.

I think everyone is working on this in good faith. The bill that will be introduced is written on paper. It is not written on stone. We are wide open to suggestions as to what kind of a vehicle it is that will address this like firemen and not in a slower fashion like other health challenges have presented.

Senator MURPHY and I have had a number of discussions on this. We are both committed to reach the goals that I know Senator DURBIN and that I think this whole body wants to reach. We are going to hold a series of hearings as to how to do this, how best to do it, how it should be funded, how it should be organized, and how the management should take place. What it is not going to focus on is the finger-pointing for what happened after COVID escaped from a bat into a human being in Wuhan, China, and what happened after it left Wuhan, China, and went around the world. We have really good information on that already.

There is going to be a lot of other investigations and hearings and that sort of thing. We want to talk about, what do we do when this happens in the future? How can we create an agency that just like the fire department, when the bell rings, they pull their boots on; they slide down the pole; they get on the truck; and they go put out the fire.

I guarantee Senator DURBIN that we will continue to work on this. My staff tells me—and I am glad to hear that Mr. DURBIN's staff is working with them on the language on this particular resolution, and I thank the Senator for that and I invite him and commit to him that we will work with him as we develop this new legislation and as we go through the hearings.

So, again, please don't take this as combative. It is not. It is intended, in

the best spirit, to help us all move forward to get to a piece of very significant legislation that will hopefully take us forward like PEPFAR did and as some of the other monumental pieces of legislation did that can address this incredibly difficult situation and hurtful situation not only for America but for the world.

And I state to the Senator that I invite your participation, encourage your participation, and assure you that we will work in good faith to try to reach these goals.

With that, I object for the reasons stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have respect for my colleague and thank him for his positive statement about the work to be done in the Foreign Relations Committee. There is nothing in this resolution that preempts or tries to impact on anything he mentioned. The operative language is a few words, "urging renewed United States leadership and participation in any global efforts on therapeutics and vaccine development and delivery to address COVID-19 and prevent further death."

How we do that, whether we create an agency or not, this is simply an expression of policy that I hope we can embrace. I will be back if we don't move forward with alternatives. Lives are at stake, and we should be part of the international conversation to avoid it.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a few moments?

Mr. DURBIN. Certainly.

Mr. RISCH. Thank you. I appreciate these comments. There is nothing that the Senator just stated that I disagree with. One point, in passing, and I say this in the spirit of trying to get to the objective that I laid out, and that is, it is my intent to engage the second branch of government, not only the agencies that are responsible for this—Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, the State Department, USAID—but also the White House. The President has to have a role here. He has obviously undertaken the role. I have already spoken to him about this. I intend to have other lengthy conversations about this. I am engaging the President to assist us. This is not a partisan issue.

As Mr. DURBIN has pointed out, and rightfully so, this virus doesn't care whether you are a Republican or Democrat; it doesn't care whether you are an American or not an American. It doesn't care if you are a President of the United States or, in the case of some countries around the world, a member of the highest authority there is in that country. The virus just doesn't care.

In order for us to accomplish this, it is going to be a bill—it is not going to be a resolution—and it has to be approved by the second branch of government. They fully understand what we

are trying to do here. They have committed their resources and their input to this, and I am convinced they are working in good faith, just as everyone here is, to try to reach these goals of doing something better in the future than what we have experienced just recently.

Senator, again, thank you for your attention to this. Thank you for your input, and I commend to you that we will work together on this as we go forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

PROTESTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Monday, President Trump stood in the Rose Garden and called for the use of military force against individuals who have been gathering across the country protesting racism and police brutality against Black Americans. This historic call for empowering the Commander in Chief to militarize law enforcement in our Nation pushes this President's reach for new Executive authority to the most extreme level.

This follows the President's tweets since last week, threatening to turn "vicious dogs"—his words—on protesters outside the White House and quoting the racist phrase from the 1967 Miami police chief, stating: "When the looting starts, the shooting starts," bringing to mind, sadly, for many, shameful moments in our Nation's struggle for civil rights.

President Trump said nothing to address the anguish felt by many in this country, particularly people of color, and instead called on Governors to "dominate the streets," as though the Americans, who peacefully exercise their right to protest, are an enemy force.

Initially, Defense Secretary Esper went even further when he referred to cities as a "battlespace." I am heartened by the fact that he has made it clear that he does not support the President's suggestion of militarizing the police forces and police across America. These calls by the President to militarize cities across America ignore that for far too long he urged law enforcement to "dominate," as the President often says, rather than to protect and serve, which is exactly what is contributing to the challenge we face today.

The other night, minutes before Mayor Bowser's 7 p.m. curfew came into effect, the President used law enforcement personnel to use tear gas and rubber bullets on peaceful demonstrators in LaFayette Square across the street from the White House. They even beat these peaceful demonstrators with batons and shields. There are conflicting reports as to whether the National Guard participated in the violence. I have made a direct inquiry to the Department of Defense, and they have denied it.

According to press reports, the assault began with law enforcement kneeling, not to express any solidarity

with any racism efforts as we have seen some police officers do across the country; instead, they were kneeling to put on gas masks to protect themselves from the weapons they were readying to fire.

As soon as this gathering was dispersed, the President marched across LaFayette Square to St. John's Episcopal Church. The Attorney General, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff all followed—only the battle that they were witnessing was against Americans using their voices to stop racism who got in the way of a Presidential photo opportunity.

I simply cannot understand what the President and each of these senior officials were thinking, if they were consciously deciding to be part of this by taking a stroll in the aftermath of the violence in Lafayette Square and whether they approved of that treatment of their fellow Americans.

The Rt. Rev. Mariann Budde, the Episcopal bishop of Washington, DC, said she was not even given a courtesy call by the White House ahead of the President's action. In fact, the bishop was outraged by the use of physical force and tear gas in the shadow of her church to remove peaceful protesters so that the church and the Bible could be used for some photo opportunity.

President Trump has “not acknowledged the agony of our country right now,” she said in an interview. “Everything he has said and done is to inflame violence.”

President Trump's actions violate the sanctity of our First Amendment freedoms and represent an abuse of his authority. We know this President well after more than 3 years. As shocking as Monday night's events were, they represent through and through who this President really is. It is wrong.

The American people will have the last word in November, but I am encouraged to see that in my home State of Illinois officials have rejected the use of military force and are committed to American's right to protest. Governor Pritzker said the President's call to send troops to Illinois is “illegal” and “ridiculous.” Chicago Mayor Lightfoot has called to “turn our pain into purpose” and to “learn from this moment and move forward together.”

In my hometown of Springfield, IL, on Tuesday, three high school students, young African-American women, sponsored a Black Lives Matter rally, and 1,000 people in Springfield, IL, gathered peacefully to demonstrate against racism in law enforcement. No windows were broken. No one was arrested. They exercised their constitutional rights, and I am damn proud of them. They speak for me and for America; that we still have the right to stand up and express ourselves, and they did so effectively.

Right now those around the President should look themselves in the mirror and ask whose agenda they are serving and whether it is the right

agenda for America. The collective leadership of our military, civilian and uniformed alike, needs to decide what kind of leaders they want to be for the men and women in uniform they command and what legacy they want to be associated with. Monday night was not the legacy this country deserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article and the statements of the Episcopal bishop of Washington be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post]

EPISCOPAL BISHOP ON PRESIDENT TRUMP: ‘EVERYTHING HE HAS SAID AND DONE IS TO INFLAME VIOLENCE’

(By Michelle Boorstein and Sarah Pulliam Bailey)

The Right Rev. Mariann Budde, the Episcopal bishop of Washington, was seething.

President Trump had just visited St. John's Episcopal Church, which sits across from the White House. It was a day after a fire was set in the basement of the historic building amid protests over the death of George Floyd in the custody of Minneapolis police.

Before heading to the church, where presidents have worshiped since the days of James Madison, Trump gave a speech at the White House emphasizing the importance of law and order. Federal officers then used force to clear a large crowd of peaceful demonstrators from the street between the White House and the church, apparently so Trump could make the visit.

“I am outraged,” Budde said in a telephone interview a short time later, pausing between words to emphasize her anger as her voice slightly trembled.

She said she had not been given any notice that Trump would be visiting the church and did not approve of the manner in which the area was secured for his appearance.

“I am the bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington and was not given even a courtesy call, that they would be clearing [the area] with tear gas so they could use one of our churches as a prop,” Budde said.

She excoriated the president for standing in front of the church—its windows boarded up with plywood—holding up a Bible, which Budde said “declares that God is love.”

“Everything he has said and done is to inflame violence,” Budde of the president. “We need moral leadership, and he's done everything to divide us.”

In a written statement, Presiding Bishop Michael Curry, head of the Episcopal denomination, accused Trump of using “a church building and the Holy Bible for partisan political purposes.”

“This was done in a time of deep hurt and pain in our country, and his action did nothing to help us or to heal us,” Curry wrote.

“The prophet Micah taught that the Lord requires us to ‘do justice, love mercy and walk humbly with our God,’” he continued, calling on Trump and others in power to be moral. “For the sake of George Floyd, for all who have wrongly suffered, and for the sake of us all, we need leaders to help us to be ‘one nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all.’”

Budde and Curry are among the pantheon of progressive religious leaders who have long been critical of Trump's political agenda. The Episcopal Church's policies include supporting abortion rights, refugee resettlement, an expansion of health care and other issues that Trump has opposed or not em-

braced. According to the Pew Research Center, 49 percent of Episcopalians are Democrats or lean Democratic, compared with 39 percent of church members who are Republican or lean Republican.

Trump's longtime religious allies, who are far more conservative on both domestic and foreign policy, saw his walk to St. John's much differently. “What kind of church I need PERMISSION to attend,” tweeted Pastor Mark Burns of South Carolina after Budde and others said Trump should have let them know he was coming. “Jesus welcomes All.”

Johnnie Moore, a spokesman for several of Trump's evangelical religious advisers, tweeted favorably about the incident as well. “I will never forget seeing @POTUS @realDonaldTrump slowly & in-total-command walk from the @WhiteHouse across Lafayette Square to St. John's Church defying those who aim to derail our national healing by spreading fear, hate & anarchy,” he wrote. “After just saying, ‘I will keep you safe.’”

Trump did not enter St. John's on Monday evening. No one associated with the church was present for his visit.

Andrew Whitehead, a sociologist at Clemson University who studies Christian nationalism, said the president's appearance was an attempt to promote the idea of America as a distinctly Christian nation after his Rose Garden speech.

“Going to the church, not going in it, not meeting with any clergy, holding up a Bible, but not quoting any scripture, after an authoritarian speech, was about using the religious symbolism for his ends,” Whitehead said.

“It was a signal to the people that embrace the idea of a Christian nation, that he will defend Christianity in the public sphere,” Whitehead said. “He said he'll make America safe. That raised the question, for whom? It's largely for white, mostly Protestant America.”

Budde—who spent 18 years in as a rector in Minneapolis before being elected bishop of the Washington diocese—said the Episcopal Church disassociates itself from the messages offered by the president.

“We hold the teachings of our sacred texts to be so so grounding to our lives and everything we do,” she said. “It is about love of neighbor and sacrificial love and justice.”

Following a tradition set by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Trump attended a service at St. John's before his swearing-in ceremony in 2017. He visited the church again that year to mark a national day of prayer for victims of Hurricane Harvey and in 2019 on St. Patrick's Day.

Budde said she learned he was headed back to the yellow, 19th-century building on Monday by watching the news.

“No one knew this was happening,” she said. “I don't want President Trump speaking for St. John's.”

The Rev. Robert W. Fisher, the church rector, said he felt blindsided by the visit. Usually, the White House gives the church at least 30 minutes' notice before the president comes by.

“We want St. John's to be a space for grace, as a place where you can breathe,” he said. “Being used as a prop, it really takes away from what we're trying to do.”

Earlier in the day, Fisher said, he and other clergy were outside the church handing out water bottles and granola bars to protesters, and expressing solidarity with their cause. He said he left the area to be interviewed on television about the damage from the fire the previous night and later watched images of the protest being dismantled “with disbelief.”

Fisher, 44, became the rector of St. John's in June 2019 and has not yet hosted a presidential visit. The church usually draws

about 400 people on a typical weekend. But it has been closed since mid-March due to the broad shutdown restrictions in place to combat the novel coronavirus.

Damage to the building from Sunday night's fire and vandalism will cost at least \$20,000, Fisher said. But he said the destruction should not become the focus of what has been happening in the streets outside the White House.

Fisher said that when people have talked about the church being burned, he has tried to redirect them, saying it was likely one person who does not represent the majority of people protesting.

"That has pulled away from the more important message that we have to address racism in this country," he said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

PROTESTS

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise at a time of crisis. For several months now, our Nation has been dealing with two simultaneous crises: a global health pandemic that has claimed the lives of over 100,000 Americans, over 300,000 people across the globe, and an economic crisis that has cost over 40 million Americans their jobs.

And in the midst of these two crises, we are now faced with yet another crisis: a crisis of anger, a crisis of racial division, flames that are pulling this country apart.

This crisis was precipitated by the wrongful death of George Floyd in Minneapolis, MN. At this point, most, if not all, of us have seen that horrifying video: Mr. Floyd, in handcuffs, facedown on the pavement, incapacitated, not posing a threat to anyone, and a police officer with his knee on the neck of Mr. Floyd, pressing down hard on the neck of Mr. Floyd and keeping that knee there for 8 long minutes.

Mr. Floyd begs the officer, pleads with the officer, says he can't breathe. He is in obvious and serious physical distress. Other officers are standing there, watching a defenseless, handcuffed man, pinned to the ground for 8 long minutes, with a knee pressing down on his neck.

As we all know, those actions took the life of Mr. Floyd, and, rightly, following what happened, the U.S. Department of Justice opened a civil rights investigation into the police officers' conduct. Also rightly, I believe, the local prosecutor opened—began—a criminal prosecution, a homicide prosecution, against the officer for his conduct.

Now, anytime you have an officer-involved shooting, it is easy for people to let rhetoric get carried away. It is easy to jump to conclusions. And too many players in the political world, I think, quickly move to demonize the police officer and assume the officer is wrong in every circumstance. That is not how responsible leaders, that is not how responsible Americans should behave. We should wait to see what the facts and circumstances are.

But here we have a video, and we can see what the facts and circumstances are, and there are zero legitimate law

enforcement justifications for what happened to George Floyd—none. We witnessed police brutality and abuse of power, and that is why the officers are being prosecuted.

Those should be propositions that bring all of us together. Watching the death of Mr. Floyd, for so many Americans, brought forth the long history in this country of racial discrimination, a history that began with centuries of slavery in America, a history that has seen Jim Crow laws, that has seen the Ku Klux Klan, that has seen overt and also implicit discrimination.

Young African Americans too often fear interactions with law enforcement, fear that their rights will not be protected. Our Nation's journey toward civil rights has had many troubled stops along the way, but I, for one, agree with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., that the arc of history bends toward justice. I also agree with the vision that Dr. King put forth standing on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, to an assembled crowd and an assembled protest, that he wanted to live in a nation where we would be judged—all of us would be judged not by the color of our skin but by the content of our character.

That is a vision that has animated America on our journey toward justice, and outrage at what happened to George Floyd prompted Americans across this country to speak out, to exercise their First Amendment right to speak out for racial justice, to speak out against police brutality, to speak out against abuse of power. All of that is legitimate. All of that is protected by the Constitution.

But then we saw things take an ominous turn, a dangerous turn. What, for some, was legitimate First Amendment speech, speaking out for justice, became co-opted, became taken over by violent criminal radicals.

Now, let's be clear because so much of the news media does not like clarity in this regard. When I say that, I am not saying that everybody speaking is a violent criminal radical. Indeed, there are a great many people speaking out whose heart cries for justice, cries for the justice that has been the many-centuries-long journey of this country.

But there are radicals who cynically took advantage of these protests to sow division, to sow fear, to engage in murder, to engage in violent assaults, to engage in looting, to engage in theft, to engage in intimidation, to engage in fear.

The First Amendment protects your right to speak; the First Amendment protects your right to peaceably protest; but none of us has a right to violently assault another person. None of us has a right to murder another person. None of us has a right to burn the cars of police officers, to shatter the shop windows of shops throughout this country, to engage in acts of terror, threatening the lives of our fellow Americans.

To those radicals who cynically tried to co-opt these protests, I will say

their actions were profoundly racist because they were making a decision to take what should have been a unifying moment to say this will not stand in our Nation. Our law protects everyone, regardless of the color of their skin. Every American—African American, Hispanic, White, Asian American—it doesn't matter; our laws protect everyone. That should have been a unifying moment, and the cynical, violent, radical criminals decided to co-opt these protests to turn them into, in far too many instances, riots—violent riots, terrorizing their fellow citizens.

George Floyd was a native Houstonian—my hometown. I love the city of Houston. George Floyd was active in his church in Houston. Next week, Mr. Floyd will be coming back to Houston for the last time to be buried in Houston. I am proud that last night, in the city of Houston, thousands came out to protest, and there wasn't violence last night; that the people of Houston demonstrated that you can speak, you can speak for racial justice, you can speak out against brutality without engaging in violence.

But there has been too much violence across the country and, sadly, too many politicians who are complicit in violence, who have made the political judgment to turn a blind eye to rioters, to thugs, to murderers, to those terrorizing communities.

The riots must stop. The violence must stop. The first responsibility of government is to keep people safe. Right now, in too many of our cities, government is failing in that task.

Across the country, we see the lives which have been taken. To date, 6 U.S. States and 13 U.S. cities have declared a state of emergency because of the riots they are facing. Chicago police superintendent David Brown said that over the weekend, 132 police officers were injured, there were 48 shootings, and 699 arrests.

In Las Vegas on Monday night, rioters shot a police officer who is right now on life support. Over the past 3 days, Las Vegas police officers have arrested 338 rioters.

In St. Louis, four police officers were shot on Monday night. Fortunately, their wounds appear not to be life-threatening, but a beloved retired police captain, David Dorn, was shot and killed by looters at a pawn shop that same night.

Mr. Dorn joined the St. Louis police force in 1969. He was a dedicated law enforcement officer for nearly 40 years. His wife and the St. Louis community are grieving his loss. Mr. Dorn was also African American.

The phrase "Black lives matter" has become fraught with politics. It is absolutely true that Black lives matter. We should be horrified at what happened to George Floyd, but we should also be horrified at what happened to David Dorn. To those with political agendas seeking demagogue that tear this country apart, somehow David Dorn—another Black man, a different

Black man—who doesn't fit the political story they are trying to tell, disappears from their narrative.

It has become politically controversial to make a statement that every life matters. How far have we gone? Our country was founded on that proposition. The Declaration of Independence tells us we hold these truths to be self-evident that all men—not some men, not just White men or White women, but all men—of every race, of every creed, of every religion—are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights that, among them, are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, our country has not always delivered on that promise for every American, but that is the journey we have traveled toward that vision.

David Dorn's life matters. For every reporter fanning up division who doesn't stop to honor David Dorn, shame on you. His life mattered, and he didn't need to be murdered by violent looters exploiting the tensions and division.

In protests Monday night in Buffalo, NY, three police officers were run over by a car, breaking a leg and shattering the pelvis of one of the officers.

In New York City, almost 2,000 people have been arrested since the rioting started, and 700 people were arrested just on Monday night. At least two New York City police officers were hit by cars on Monday and nearly 50 New York Police Department officers have been injured since the protests began.

In Salt Lake City, 21 police officers were injured over the weekend, including an officer who was hit in the head with a bat.

On Sunday, during the riot that took place outside the White House when the historic St. John's Church was burned, when arsonists burned the church, 14 Secret Service agents were injured.

In San Francisco over the weekend, at least 20 fires were set, 33 people were arrested for looting, and 2 police officers were attacked.

On Friday night, David Patrick Underwood, an officer in the Department of Homeland Security, was shot and killed during protests in Oakland, CA.

David Patrick Underwood, like David Dorn, was African American. George Floyd's life matters. So does David Dorn's. So does David Patrick Underwood's. No elected leader should sit idly by while David Patrick Underwood or David Dorn or George Floyd is murdered. If Black lives matter, then all Black lives matter, not just those which are politically convenient for politicians.

It has been reported that at least 25 cities in the United States have seen deadly, destructive riots in the last week. According to the Claims Journal, which reports and analyzes the property claims industry, 75 businesses in Madison, WI, have been looted; 50 businesses in Seattle; 50 businesses in

Pittsburgh; and 45 properties in Chicago have suffered damages. In New York City, iconic stores up and down Broadway and Fifth Avenue have been vandalized and looted.

In Atlanta, everything from big-box stores to small businesses have been destroyed, looted, and damaged. In Atlanta, a Black-owned small business, a clothing store, was completely looted in the wee hours of a Saturday morning. To store owner Kris Shelby, the loss was devastating.

Mr. Shelby told the New York Times that "as a black man, and this is a black-owned business, it's just sad." Looting and destroying Mr. Shelby's business does not further the cause of racial justice. It is the act of a cynical, violent thief and a thief willing to be a bigoted racist on top of it.

In Philadelphia over the weekend, nearly 250 businesses were burglarized, over 375 fires set ablaze. Pause and think about that number. One city, Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love—370 fires.

This is wrong. This is shocking. This is horrifying. You are not exercising your First Amendment rights when you are lighting a police car on fire. You are not exercising any constitutional rights when you are burning and terrorizing and assaulting your fellow citizens. Eighteen law enforcement officers were injured in Philadelphia—some hit by Molotov cocktails, others by rocks and bricks. Ross Martinson, the owner of a small business called the Philadelphia Runner, told the Philadelphia Enquirer: "What is left is mush" after rioters attempted to light three fires in his store, stole clothes, stole shoes, smashed the windows, and left the store flooding from the sprinklers.

In Los Angeles, the rioting and looting has brought back painful memories of the 1992 Rodney King riots that resulted in 50 deaths, thousands of arrests, and the destruction of over 1,000 businesses and buildings.

One Santa Monica furniture store, the owner named Roman, told the L.A. Times that over the weekend, "we lost everything in 10 minutes." Roman said that 10 minutes of looting resulted in \$6 million in damages.

Mind you, all of this is happening after months of small businesses being on the verge of bankruptcy from the coronavirus pandemic and the economic catastrophe we are facing.

Now we have local politicians saying: We are not going to let police officers protect your store. We are not going to let police officers protect your livelihood. Everything you own can be taken and destroyed by violent criminals.

In New York, according to ABC7 New York, businesses, such as delis, pharmacies, beauty supply stores, were destroyed and multiple fires set in Fordham in the Bronx on Monday, while the flagship Macy's store and scores of other retail stores were burglarized, looted, damaged, in downtown Manhattan over the weekend and Monday. And

throughout it all, New York police department officers are calling for the politicians to take the handcuffs off them, to let them actually protect their city and protect their fellow citizens. But too many politicians have a different agenda.

If you are not willing to say that what happened to George Floyd was wrong, it was unacceptable, it was criminal, then you should get the hell out of public office. But if you are also not willing to say that what has happened to these store owners, what has happened to these police officers—the stores that have been looted, the officers who have been murdered and assaulted—if you are not willing to say that is wrong, it is criminal, it is unacceptable, and it must stop, then you need to get the hell out of public office. This ain't complicated. Protect people's lives. Protect their rights.

In Minneapolis, where George Floyd was killed, Tiwana Jackson, an African-American small business owner with an eyelash extension studio, told a Business of Fashion reporter that her store had been looted and vandalized during the riots. Tiwana said: "Burning stores down, stealing things—how is that going to get justice for George Floyd?"

She continued: "It almost took my focus away on why this whole thing started in the first place, which was racism."

In Richmond, VA, David Waller saw the jewelry store that he runs—that his grandfather founded in the year 1900—ransacked by rioters over the weekend. Waller and Company is one of the oldest Black-owned businesses in Richmond. How is that justice?

In Washington, DC, not only was the historic St. John's Church burned—where every President we have had has worshipped—but the Lincoln Memorial was vandalized, as well as the World War II Memorial was vandalized, and the Victims of Communism Memorial was vandalized. That is not standing up for justice.

The Lincoln Memorial—Abraham Lincoln led this Nation during the bloodiest war we have ever encountered, the Civil War. Six hundred thousand Americans died in the Civil War. And Abraham Lincoln's vision, restoring this country and ending the abomination of slavery—I have to say, the Lincoln Memorial is my favorite place in all of Washington to go and stand and read the words etched in stone, to read the Gettysburg Address, to read the second inaugural of the President who signed the Emancipation Proclamation, the President whose leadership through that Civil War, whose leadership to end slavery cost him his life at the hands of an assassin. Yet vandals defaced it.

The U.S. Park Police reported that the protests on the National Mall and at Lafayette Park across the street from the White House resulted in 51 injured U.S. Park Police officers. Eleven of those injured officers had to go to

the hospital for treatment, and three had to be admitted because of their injuries.

In my home State of Texas, we have seen riots in Austin, San Antonio, Dallas, and Houston, my hometown—the hometown of George Floyd. In Austin, over the weekend, protesters tried to block a highway and destroyed multiple businesses, including a gas station, a Food Mart, a hotel, a Target, a Foot Locker, and other stores and businesses.

In Houston, another group of protesters closed down Highway 59, and rioters destroyed businesses and injured police officers.

This must stop. There are a host of tools that can be used to stop it. The first lines of defense when it comes to violent crime are the brave men and women of our police departments who are risking their lives every night as they engage with rioters and violent criminals.

Just as it is a slander to say that every protester is a violent rioter, it is also a slander—an absolute vicious lie—to paint every police officer as a racist, to paint every police officer as someone who commits abuse of power and police brutality, as we saw with George Floyd.

Yes, there are some who break the law, and that is why the officers are being prosecuted. The rule of law extends to everyone. If a police officer breaks the law, he or she should be prosecuted. But when we are looking to protect our own families, when we are looking to protect our spouse, when we are looking to protect our children—the people we call on to be our first line of defense are the men and women in blue.

Local officials who have decided politically that they are not going to let the police officers arrest the rioters, but they are going to release the rioters; the media that turn a blind eye and don't report on the police officers being murdered; the Hollywood celebrities who virtue signal and raise money to pay the bail for the people being arrested for violent looting—every one of them is contributing to this problem.

We also have Federal resources. I have spoken with U.S. attorneys in the State of Texas who are directing Federal resources. There are Federal laws on the books against rioting: 18 USC, section 2101, makes it a crime to travel in or use interstate commerce to incite a riot or participate in a riot; 18 USC, section 231, makes it a crime to “obstruct, impede, or interfere” with a law enforcement officer performing his or her duties “in any way” that affects commerce; 18 USC, section 844, makes it a crime to “maliciously [damage] or [destroy], or [attempt] to damage or destroy, by means of fire or an explosive, any building, vehicle, or other real or personal property used in interstate or foreign commerce”; 18 USC, section 1962, the RICO statute, makes it a crime for anyone associated with

an enterprise to engage in a pattern of racketeering activity where racketeering activity includes arson and robbery; 26 USC, section 5861(d) makes it a crime to possess a destructive device, which is defined in a way that includes a Molotov cocktail; and 18 USC, section 2314, makes it a crime to transport interstate or sell goods that are stolen.

All of those are Federal laws that are available for Federal prosecutors, that are available to the FBI. The message that needs to come clear—loud and clear—from every elected official is if you engage in violence, if you engage in looting, if you destroy shops, if you shatter windows, if you light police cars on fire, if you commit acts of violence, if you physically assault your fellow citizens, if you physically assault police officers, if you kill your fellow citizens, if you kill police officers, you will be prosecuted. You will be prosecuted, and you will go away to jail for a very long time.

There are organizations that are promoting this, that are funding this, that are coordinating this—organizations like antifa. For 2 years, I have been calling on the administration to designate antifa as a domestic terrorist organization. They have engaged in acts of violence all across this country. But this past week has been antifa's most shameful act.

This week, the President rightly announced that antifa would be designated as a terrorist organization. That means we can use law enforcement resources to track down—if you are providing funding and organizing, you will be prosecuted. We will use the RICO laws against you, the same laws that take down drug dealers.

If you are handing out bricks to young African-American men, trying to incite them to commit acts of violence, that is a criminal activity. It is also a cynical, bigoted activity. This must stop.

Our first responsibility is to protect our fellow citizens, to protect their lives, to protect their safety, to protect their rights. The President has that responsibility. The Attorney General has that responsibility. Every U.S. attorney in the country has that responsibility. The FBI has that responsibility. The Governors of all 50 States have that responsibility. Mayors have that responsibility. Police chiefs have that responsibility.

It is time for this to stop. It is time for us to come together. And it is time for the demagogues who peddle the vision, who seek personal benefit in fanning the flames of racial animosity, to stop playing games with people's lives.

If you are a Hollywood celebrity and want to make a contribution, make a contribution to a fund rebuilding the small businesses, the African-American businesses, the Hispanic businesses that have been looted and burned and destroyed. Make a contribution to a fund to the families of the police officers murdered. Don't pay to bail out the criminals assaulting those police

officers, burning those African-American small businesses, looting those African-American small businesses. You are not a social justice warrior. If you are lining up, seeking accolades for your support of violent criminals who are deliberately targeting the African-American community, I will tell you right now, you are not advancing racial equality if you are supporting violent criminals who are destroying far too many African-American communities and Hispanic communities. That is not helping the problem.

We need to keep America safe. We need to protect every American, regardless of race, regardless of skin color. We need to come together and keep America safe.

I yield the floor.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, for months, as our Nation has confronted this pandemic together, everyone in America—every single one of us—has been asked to make serious sacrifices, whether that has meant working overtime in a hospital caring for the afflicted, temporarily closing a family business, euthanizing hogs and cattle, or forgoing important life events like a high school prom or a college graduation. COVID-19 has brought with it very challenging times.

While we have missed milestones and time together, Americans across the country have stepped up to help slow the spread of this virus and its toll on the lives of our fellow citizens. While we cannot return to life as usual just yet, we are entering a new phase. Step by step, State by State, America is safely reopening.

In Iowa, Governor Kim Reynolds has led our State with a steady hand during this critical time. Under Governor Reynolds' thoughtful plan and guidance from public health officials at the local, State, and Federal level, Iowa communities and businesses are starting to safely reopen, and many activities are carefully resuming. Iowans can once again participate in America's great pastime and play golf. Places of worship are opening for services while taking smart precautions. And while they will not be as crowded as they once were, restaurants and bars are taking the first steps in opening again, as well as are places that we all grew up going to in Iowa—our amusement parks, racetracks, outdoor performance venues, movie theaters, and museums—all with important public health guidelines in mind.

All of this is contingent, of course, upon having smaller groups of people and continuing to practice social distancing—simple precautions that can make a big difference.

While we all yearn for life to return back to how it was a few months ago, we must be smart about taking the appropriate steps. Certainly, we want to see our elderly relatives, gather with our family and friends once again, and

return to work and school. But, folks, the pandemic is not over. Let's take this one step at a time and keep in mind that while restrictions are being loosened, they are not eliminated, and there is a good reason for that.

As this process moves forward, Washington can make this transition more safe and successful. Working in partnership with the administration, State leaders, and the private sector, we can continue to increase testing and ensure those who may be infected are following proper guidelines and getting the care and information they need to limit the spread of the virus. We need to make sure our essential workers and others returning to the workforce have the personal protective equipment—the PPE—necessary to allow America to get back to work while ensuring the safety of our great workers.

In addition, these frontline essential workers should absolutely be able to keep more of their hard-earned paycheck—something I am working on closely with the administration and my colleagues. Our small businesses must be protected from predatory lawsuits so that Iowa's mom-and-pop shops can continue to provide paychecks to their hard-working employees.

Of course, we must continue to support our families—our moms and dads who are struggling to purchase diapers; our childcare providers and workers who have continued to look after our kids; our family caregivers who are helping Iowa seniors and those who are most at risk during this pandemic—and make sure we are prepared for whatever might come next.

Let's not only focus on the immediate needs but on the long-term national priority for critical medical supplies and other materials to be produced right here in the United States of America. We should never again depend on a foreign nation to protect our citizens, especially one like the Communist Party of China, which has been continually and unsurprisingly deceptive about this threat from the very beginning.

Folks, while we still have a ways to go before we can return to life as we know it, we will get through this, and when we do, we will revive the great economy we have built together and prepare for an even stronger future together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join my colleague from Iowa to highlight the need to responsibly reopen America and our economy as we continue to fight this COVID pandemic.

PROTESTS

Mr. President, before I talk about reopening America, I would like to address a deep tragedy—the brutal death of George Floyd.

It is clear that our entire country is united in horror and opposition to the

violent killing. Racial discrimination has absolutely no place in this country whatsoever. This senseless murder is unacceptable, and those responsible should be held accountable. I am anguished at the death of George Floyd. I am anguished at the violence we are seeing all across our streets today. There is no question that we must do our part to change racist attitudes that, unfortunately, exist today, and this must be done in a peaceful way. Looting and violent riots are not the way to do this, and it is not the way to honor George Floyd or those who are protesting peacefully, which is the great majority of people.

The other day, George's brother encouraged all of us to peacefully protest. He said that violence will not bring his brother back. No, it will not bring his brother back.

It makes me sad to see businesses and monuments that honor some of our bravest heroes destroyed and violence happening in cities across the Nation. In my State of West Virginia, there have been protests. However, they have been peaceful. I commend my West Virginians for peacefully protesting, and I encourage them to continue this. Instead of violence, we need to come together as a nation, to listen to one another, and to learn from one another. This is how real change can happen.

President George W. Bush and Mrs. Laura Bush published a statement yesterday, and I would like to read the last paragraph because I found it really quite moving as to how we are going to address this issue.

The rule of law ultimately depends on the fairness and legitimacy of the legal system. And achieving justice for all is the duty of all. This will require a consistent, courageous, and creative effort. We serve our neighbors best when we try to understand their experience. We love our neighbors as ourselves when we treat them as equals, in both protection and compassion. There is a better way—the way of empathy, and shared commitment, and bold action, and a peace rooted in justice. I am confident that together, Americans will choose the better way.

I appreciate so much the entire statement. Those last several words, as I said, really touched me.

On the matter before us today, many communities in our country are beginning to open, including in my State of West Virginia. As everywhere, COVID has had a terrible impact on many of our communities all across the country. The disease has affected every part of our lives. More than 105,000 of our fellow Americans have lost their lives because of this terrible virus. That includes 78 West Virginians. The unofficial unemployment rate is 14 percent in this country, but in my State of West Virginia, it is a shade over 15 percent, and we expect those numbers to rise when the May numbers are published later this week.

State and local officials across the country closed much of our economy in order to slow the disease. Our goal as a nation was to bend the curve in order

to prevent our hospitals and other medical providers from being overrun. In West Virginia, as in most of the country, we have been successful in bending the curve and reducing the spread of this terrible disease. It is important, as we move now to responsibly reopening our economy, to continue to follow the guidelines that have been prepared by our public health experts—washing our hands, social distancing, avoiding touching your face, and wearing your mask. Following these guidelines will help to make America's reopening successful. It will protect your health and the health of your community. Hindering the spread of the disease while allowing businesses to remain open as they follow the guidelines will aid in our economic recovery as well.

Most Americans understand there is no way to choose between public health and a strong economy because you cannot have one without the other. We can't have a strong economy if we are not protecting people from becoming sick, and we will not be able to make the necessary long-term investments in public health if we don't have a strong economy. That is why a responsible, step-by-step approach to reopening the economy that is driven by the data in States and local communities is so very important.

West Virginia's cumulative percentage of positive tests now stands at 2 percent, which is less than one-fifth of the national average. As of this morning, our daily positive test percentage was 0.88 percent. This is despite the fact that West Virginia has tested a higher percentage of our residents than the national average and all of our neighboring States. Even more encouraging is that, even as we began reopening our businesses in May, our cumulative percent of positive tests has remained below 3 percent since April 25.

Yet we have faced challenges. Outbreaks at our long-term care facilities in Monongalia County, Wayne County, Jackson County, and Kanawha County have resulted in 43 deaths, but do you know what? Our State responded quickly and tested every resident and every staff member in the nursing homes in our State. We were the first State in our Nation to do this and set the example that many have followed. Just last week, we had an outbreak at one of our prisons, where we had 118 positive tests. So we know that this is still there and that it still presents a danger, but I am really proud of the way we have pulled together during this crisis and addressed these challenges.

The progress reflected by the statistics is only possible because our State's residents have followed the guidelines. I thank all of the medical professionals, the first responders, and the frontline workers who have gone beyond the call of duty to protect public health and keep our communities running during this most difficult time.

Opening our economy is paramount, and opening it responsibly must be

done. Even though the COVID is still with us, we must continue working together and following the guidelines so we can protect both our economy and our health.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

RESTART ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, last week, I traveled around the great State of Indiana on my RESTART tour.

I visited small businesses up and down the State—eight cities, in fact—where we have seen so many Hoosiers adversely impacted by this pandemic. Like many other States, Indiana is starting to open up our economy, and I know so many Hoosiers welcome that. Our Governor, Eric Holcomb, has been implementing a five-stage plan for safely reopening Indiana's economy.

The cities on my tour have businesses that are in various stages of reopening. Restaurants like Catablu Grille in Fort Wayne, Arni's in Lafayette, and Woody's Library in Carmel are open at 50-percent capacity right now. The nonprofit Terre Haute Children's Museum remains closed, unfortunately, and is struggling to pay its employees. I visited Zimmer Biomet Hibbard, which is a medical device company in Valparaiso. I enjoyed the tour and visiting with the employees, but I discovered that its sales had dropped 95 percent in March. Fortunately, it received a Paycheck Protection Program loan, and that enabled it to keep all 23 of its employees on the payroll.

It is clear that we need to continue evaluating additional relief measures for small businesses and Indiana's nonprofits. My RESTART Act is a viable approach to help keep our hardest hit businesses and nonprofits going. The RESTART Act is a bipartisan measure I introduced with Senator BENNET. The effort here is to build upon the success of the Paycheck Protection Program. We have seen that more than 74,000 Hoosier businesses have benefited from PPP, with loans totaling nearly \$9.4 billion in the State of Indiana. Just for context, that is an average loan of about \$130,000. These are for small businesses like those that we see up and down our State.

The Paycheck Protection Program requires funds to be spent in just 8 weeks, but most restaurants, gyms, boutiques, and so many other businesses were not permitted to be open during part or all of that 8-week period. So the first part of the RESTART Act merely extends the timeframe to 16 weeks for our Nation's hardest hit businesses.

Secondly, we know that the PPP was meant to be a bridge to reopening the economy, but many small businesses have much longer bridges to cross. That is why our new RESTART Program would provide loans that would cover up to 6 months of payroll and fixed operating expenses. That is just for those businesses that have taken a

substantial revenue hit during this coronavirus pandemic. My RESTART initiative would provide needed funds with the flexibility for employers to pay bills and to implement social distancing measures, like with those Plexiglas dividers I have seen at so many businesses. Most importantly, it would bring employees back to work, which is exactly where they want to be.

Over the last several weeks, I have spoken to more than 22,000 Hoosiers by using Zoom teleconferencing capabilities, having conference calls, and other means. I have to say I am truly inspired by the way Hoosiers have come together to help one another during this pandemic. Everyone has done his part. Hoosiers want to work, and business owners are eager to pay them. The RESTART Act can help make sure this happens, and I hope my colleagues will give it strong consideration in the coming days.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BRAUN and I be allowed to complete our remarks prior to the rollcall votes.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I have to say that Tennesseans are enjoying being out and about. They are so thrilled to see the restart of our economy. Whether you are going to hair salons, restaurants, shopping centers, office parks, or manufacturing facilities, what we are hearing from Tennesseans is: Thank goodness we can get back to work. They are grateful that they have had the PPP to help them bridge from the shutdown to the restart. There has been \$8.8 billion that has made its way into our State through the PPP program, and our Governor, our Tennessee General Assembly, and our mayors are really working diligently to be certain that our economy opens up, that people are at work safely, and that we continue to defeat this COVID-19.

Over the past few months, we have seen Congress push forward, putting about \$3 trillion into the economy for a restart, and State and local governments have already put over \$139 billion worth of aid to good use by supporting local healthcare, helping to rescue businesses, and keeping companies working and local payrolls going—keeping people on the job.

Our Governor and general assembly in Tennessee have just announced a new program that they are doing in conjunction with local businesses. Now, imagine for a moment what it was like to watch the economy tumble from the perspective of a community that was already struggling and trying to make ends meet. The pandemic caused catastrophic damage to the traditional economy and also to many of the service organizations that were

there to meet needs. In Tennessee, as in many States, struggling communities depend on these nonprofit groups. This is why we fought so hard to include eligibility for nonprofits in the rescue funding packages.

I will tell you that this is making a difference in Tennessee for some of our nonprofit organizations, like the East Tennessee-based Appalachia Service Project. ASP teams travel throughout Central Appalachia. They repair homes for low-income families. Mayors in the communities that ASP visit are running on tight budgets, and they depend on volunteers to fix up unsafe or uninhabitable homes. You can only imagine how it felt to the people at ASP to watch their funding evaporate, knowing that the leaky roof that needed attention over in Sneedville would end up turning into a rotten floor and a moldy wall and would be a safety hazard for the individuals who lived there. Fortunately, ASP was able to get an SBA loan that gave it a little bit of breathing room. Although it has had to cancel its volunteer program, its essential staff and contractors will be able to continue working all through the summer.

The various rescue programs that Congress agreed to implement were not perfect by any means, but did they have a positive effect? From what we are hearing in Tennessee, they did, and they have been put to good use.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I am a Main Street entrepreneur. I have spent my career building a little business into a large one over many years in my hometown. My wife, as well, has operated a home accessory and gift store on Main Street, literally. I am elated to see the American economy starting to get off to a smart restart.

I addressed, in a couple of floor speeches before we left in March, the question of how to reopen our economy. I believe businesses are disciplined and ready to pay attention to the rules—the new normal—to make sure their employees and their customers stay safe. Business owners will follow the rules. It is in their own best interests to do so. They have much to lose from a new spike in the coronavirus. Businesses are always more adept, more agile than government, and I am heartened to see the innovative approaches many businesses are taking across our country to address this challenge.

The virus does not affect all populations, industries, and areas of our country in the same way. So, naturally, the reopening in Indianapolis will be different from that on Main Street in Jasper, IN.

We should remember that although this presents challenges, a one-size-fits-all is rarely the best policy course of action, and decisions that affect citizens are best made by the level of government closest to them—mayors,

town councils, and State governments. We cannot use the blanket approach the government took in shutting down the economy to reopen it. Instead, we need to provide the tools to empower local leaders and businesses who know their communities best to reopen safely so that our country can function again.

I believe that through the perseverance and innovation that American business has always exhibited, we can get our economy back on the path to recent heights without yielding back any territory to the virus.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON ANDERSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 109 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Alexander	Feinstein	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Bennet	Gardner	Peters
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Boozman	Hassan	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Roberts
Brown	Hirono	Romney
Burr	Hoeben	Rosen
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Carper	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Coons	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cornyn	King	Shelby
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Sinema
Cotton	Leahy	Stabenow
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Loeffler	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Duckworth	McSally	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—17

Baldwin	Harris	Schumer
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Udall
Booker	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Cardin	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—5

Markey	Schatz	Tester
Sanders	Smith	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Drew B. Tipton, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Cory Gardner, Tim Scott, Ted Cruz, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, Mike Crapo, Michael B. Enzi, John Barrasso, Marsha Blackburn, John Thune, Richard C. Shelby.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Drew B. Tipton, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 110 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lankford	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Young
Enzi	Paul	
Ernst		

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Booker	Cardin
Bennet	Brown	Carper
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Casey

Coons	Kaine	Rosen
Cortez Masto	King	Schumer
Duckworth	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Durbin	Leahy	Sinema
Feinstein	Manchin	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Menendez	Udall
Harris	Merkley	Van Hollen
Hassan	Murphy	Warner
Heinrich	Murray	Warren
Hirono	Peters	Whitehouse
Jones	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Markey	Schatz	Tester
Sanders	Smith	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Drew B. Tipton, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 7010

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a moment I will ask unanimous consent to pass legislation that makes urgently needed reforms to the PPP to make the program much more functional for all—underline "all"—small businesses.

Let me just name a few of the changes. First, it expands the loan period from 8 weeks to 24 weeks. Currently, workers may be brought back for the 8 weeks, but what good is it if they are again laid off after that short period? It is unrealistic, and small businesses need assistance that can cover the full length of this crisis.

Second, the legislation removes the 25-percent restriction imposed by the Trump administration on the use of loans for fixed costs, rents, mortgages, utilities, and replaces it with new 60-40 payroll-to-nonpayroll expenses. This change will continue PPP's support in getting workers back on the payroll but giving small businesses more flexibility to survive in this crisis, which is essential to the long-term employment prospect of the workers.

For my home State of New York, we have high rents, high utility costs. Many businesses were frozen out when there was 25 percent, but 40 percent will get them in, and that applies to the more high-cost areas throughout the country. Even though these are small businesses, they are struggling under those costs.

Third, the proposal extends the program to the end of the year and makes December 31 the deadline to rehire workers in order to get full forgiveness on the loan. We have a long way to go before the economy will come back in real ways. This will give businesses a more realistic timeline to get the help they need while bringing back employees.

The bill ensures any amounts of the loan not forgiven will have at least a 5-