



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 2020

No. 103

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, June 4, 2020, at 10 a.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 2020

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, ruler of the universe, we rejoice because You are near. Lord, we are grateful we belong to You, and You desire us to call You our Father in good and bad times. We can face any calamity with the knowledge that nothing can separate us from Your love. Death and life can't. Our fears for today and our worries about tomorrow can't. Whether we are high above the clouds or in the deepest ocean, nothing in all creation can separate us from You. May this knowledge of Your abiding and indestructible love inspire our Senators to trust You with all their hearts and depend upon Your wisdom.

We pray in Your awesome Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication

to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2020.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. CAPITO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, our Nation is caught within a number of grave problems at the same time.

This week, in cities all across America, the pain of racial injustice has been compounded by violent riots that have drowned out peaceful protests and hurt innocent people. Millions of working families continue to face the historic economic fallout from the coronavirus pandemic, including unemployment levels not seen in decades, and, lest we forget, the actual pandemic itself is still with us. The virus continues to claim hundreds of American lives every day, challenge

healthcare professionals, and paralyze schools, universities, and employers that are eager to reopen. Of course, there is also the important business we would have needed to have addressed even before the pandemic.

So, for all of these reasons and more, while the Democratic House of Representatives may be absent—with no plans to return for weeks and weeks—the U.S. Senate is here and working for the American people.

This week, we are filling more critical vacancies throughout our government. Yesterday, we confirmed the Special Inspector General for Pandemic Response. This is a brandnew position born of immediate necessity and goals shared by Members of both parties. Yet, though our Democratic colleagues said for weeks that CARES Act oversight was a top priority, our colleagues chose to delay this nomination for as long as possible. When the rubber met the road, yet again, picking small fights with President Trump took precedence over urgent work for the common good.

At the same time, we also hear from the very same Democratic colleagues that they wish the Senate would spend less time on nominations. Well, the good news is that the Senate Democrats can change that whenever they want, but as long as they continue to visit delays and obstruction on even these lower level executive branch appointments, just for the sake of irritating the White House, the Senate will continue to do our job the hard way.

Of course, in the weeks ahead, we will also tackle significant legislation

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2659

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. Protest 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 onlookers 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 motions that were obviously 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 small pox, 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—we obviously were 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
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeben	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Loeffler	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Booker	Cardin
Bennet	Brown	Carper
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Casey

Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Harris
Hassan
Heinrich
Hirono
Jones

Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Menendez
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Peters
Reed

Rosen
Schumer
Shaheen
Sinema
Stabenow
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
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-

year term of repayment so that small businesses will not be saddled with the need to be repaid within 2 years. The impact of this crisis is long-lasting and requires lenient terms. We have all heard from small businesses in our States that while they are glad there is a program—they would have gone under without it; it is a very good thing—it needed some changes to make it work for so many small businesses that have been left out or rejected.

I say to small businesses across the country: After this changes, apply again even if you applied the first time because it will be easier to meet the requirements and criteria.

This is not controversial. The House of Representatives passed this legislation with a vote of 417 to 1. We can't wait any longer. Businesses are really suffering for lack of these changes, and to wait and wait and wait—if someone wants to make changes, let's do it when we get to the Heroes bill, to COVID 4. But to delay another week or 2 weeks or 3 weeks to get this all bolted up—we can't afford to wait. Our small businesses cannot afford to wait. These changes are universally agreed to as good ones, and we shouldn't let someone who wants a small change say: Let's stop it until we go forward.

The bill has the broad support of small businesses across industries, mom-and-pop restaurants, underserved businesses, minority businesses, non-profits that have been hit hard by this pandemic. It should be passed by the Senate right now.

These fixes will not solve every problem in PPP. Too many underserved small businesses and minority small businesses are still struggling to get the help they need in these troubled times. These will not diminish in any way the urgency of passing legislation like the Heroes Act, which provides additional help not only for businesses but for homeowners, renters, essential workers, medical facilities, local and State governments, and more. Our Republican colleagues must come to the table and work with us to pass future reforms.

Nor will it divert our caucus in its quest for police reform and racial justice. We have to do that as well.

But today we have an opportunity to pass meaningful reforms that our small businesses need now. We must get this done. Businesses are going under every day. Small businesses that have struggled and sweated—my dad's was one of them—that need help and can't get help because of certain problems in this bill will be so relieved when we pass this legislation, which has already passed the House.

I want to particularly thank two people on our side who have worked long and hard on this legislation, who will speak now. One is Senator CARDIN from Maryland, the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business, and one is Senator SHAHEEN, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, who is also a very active member of the Small Busi-

ness Committee. I hope that passing this legislation in a bipartisan way as it did in the House will give us momentum to keep working on the medical, economic, and racial crises that still affect our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first, let me thank Senator SCHUMER for bringing this issue to the floor at this time. Senator SCHUMER has been a great leader on what we need to do to help respond to COVID-19. He recognized from the beginning that we needed a balanced program to deal with the health pandemic, with the Marshall Plan, to deal with the help to our State and local governments, and to deal with the economic consequences of COVID-19.

Senator SCHUMER helped us develop a balanced approach to deal with the economic challenges while, yes, helping the individual through unemployment insurance and direct checks from the IRS but also helping our businesses. For small businesses we created new tools; for larger businesses we had loans.

I was proud to be part of a task force that was charged with developing the tools for small business. I want to thank my partner Senator SHAHEEN for her incredible help and leadership in crafting the programs of the Paycheck Protection Program while also dealing with the economic disaster loan program, which was new and a loan forgiveness program.

We did this working with Senators RUBIO and COLLINS. It was truly bipartisan. We did it in a matter of literally a few days—a week or so, and we were able to get this program crafted in a way that it provided incredible relief to the small businesses of our country.

So today, what is the record? There are 4.4 million loans that have been issued under the Paycheck Protection Program, and \$510 billion has been made available to small businesses in this country. It literally has been a lifeline allowing small companies to continue to exist. You see, with small companies, we get more job growth than bigger companies. We get ideas on how to deal with economic challenges. But in economic downturns they don't have the liquidity and resilience that larger companies have. That is why we had to pass this type of help. We did that in March, and when we passed those bills in March, quite frankly we thought that by now the economy would be in a much better shape than it is and that small businesses would be able to return to somewhat of a normal economy. Well, that is not the case.

We recognize that certain businesses—such as those in the hospitality field, health clubs, caterers, museums, and the list goes on and on—have virtually not been able to open at all yet, and they are going to need more help than just the 8 weeks that was planned in the Paycheck Protection Program.

That is why the legislation that passed the House was part of this bipartisan, bicameral effort to give additional flexibility for those who had the paycheck protection plan loans. We recognize now that 8 weeks is not long enough, and that is why this legislation would change that 8 weeks to 24 weeks, giving small businesses a greater opportunity to qualify for a maximum amount of loan forgiveness and giving small businesses more flexibility on how they allocate those funds between payroll and nonpayroll expenses.

As we heard today in our first oversight hearing in the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, small businesses are different. Maybe 8 weeks works for some, but maybe it doesn't work for others. Maybe 75 percent of payroll works for one but doesn't work for another. We need a program that can fit the vast majority of small businesses, and the changes represented in the House bill represents those changes that if we had recognized in March that this pandemic would have continuing impact on our economy well beyond 8 weeks, would have certainly been considered during that period of time.

Now is the time to pass this. I just want to underscore this point. The 8 weeks will expire for the first loans that were issued under the PPP program next week. Small businesses need predictability. They need to know whether this is going to be the law or not before they apply for their forgiveness. So we don't have any extra time. We need to pass this right now. It is a bipartisan effort and is a bipartisan bill.

What Senator SCHUMER said is absolutely correct. We will have other opportunities to deal with other provisions to help small businesses. We are not finished. We recognize that there are small businesses that may need additional help, particularly those who have seen dramatic reductions in their revenues and the smaller of the small businesses and those underserved communities. We need to pay attention to do something about that. But let's get this program working right today. Let's give the notices to small businesses and get this passed through the Senate today so that small businesses can plan on how to deal with the next several months.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am so pleased to be able to join Leader SCHUMER and my colleague and ranking member of the small business committee, Senator CARDIN. I am grateful for his leadership and for the partnership that we had back in March with Senators RUBIO and COLLINS. It truly was a bipartisan partnership to try and address the challenges that small businesses are facing across this country.

In New Hampshire small businesses are our lifeblood. They were going

under because of this pandemic, so the Paycheck Protection Program has been a lifesaver. But we know there are things that need to change about it in order for it to continue to help those businesses.

In New Hampshire we have 22,000 small businesses and nonprofits that have received over \$2.5 billion in forgivable loans under the program.

But we have also heard from many of those businesses that there are improvements and fixes that are necessary, businesses like The Little Grille, a New Hampshire restaurant with locations in Littleton and Woodsville. They said that PPP has been a lifesaver. But they have only 2 weeks remaining on their forgivable term, and if the terms of the loan are not addressed, the owners of The Little Grille told us that they will be back in the same position they were at the start of the pandemic, and they may be forced to lay off staff.

We have heard from the Portsmouth Brewery, which received their PPP loan, and they want to rehire their 28 employees but they need more flexibility and extensions to the program to resume operations.

Then, of course, we have heard from Big Dave's Bagels & Deli in North Conway. His 32-year-old bakery was predominantly takeout before the pandemic, but he was able to keep his employees on and offer hazard pay because his approval for the PPP loan came through at the very end of April. Now he needs flexibility and loan terms if he is going to keep his employees on the payroll.

I could go on and on with example after example, but the important thing is, as Senators SCHUMER and CARDIN have said so eloquently, those first loans are about to end, and if we don't do something to help those businesses, they are going to be back in the same place that they were in in March when the shelter-at-home and the stay-at-home orders began in New Hampshire and across this country.

So we need to do something. This legislation addresses the concerns that people have expressed. I think we also need to provide additional funding or additional help over the next month until things open back up in the economy.

But, in the short term, the legislation addresses the concerns that we have been hearing from small businesses, and I hope we are going to see our colleagues pass it by unanimous consent so that there is some certainty for those businesses as they try and open back up in this very difficult environment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, let me thank my colleagues from Maryland and New Hampshire for their eloquence.

Again, we need to act now. We have waited long enough to make these changes. The House passed them 417 to 1. There may be changes people want to make, but I would urge that we pass

this bill now—we pass this bill immediately—because small businesses need the certainty. In the next week or two, many will be affected negatively if we don't get this legislation passed.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 710, which was received from the House; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Is there objection?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I appreciate my colleague's desire to help small businesses. I really don't think there is a stronger advocate in support of small business in all of Congress. I think I have proved that with my work in tax reform, fighting for 95 percent of American businesses that are pass-through entities.

I think my colleagues on the floor here today realize that what the House passed has one very significant flaw in it—probably a technical drafting error but a significant flaw—which says that if you don't spend 60 percent of the PPP loan on payroll, you get no forgiveness, which was a dramatic difference from what it was when you had 75 percent.

I am in favor of all those changes. As Senator SHAHEEN pointed out, there are a lot of problems with PPP that need to be corrected. My only objection is, before we authorize this and put an authorization date all the way to December 31, we need to make sure those changes are made.

So my only objection is we should not extend this authorization without significant reforms that I hope my colleagues would all agree with; for example, the fact that many businesses—again, I am not denying that PPP provided very swift funding to businesses that truly needed it. It was a real lifeline. It worked from that standpoint.

But, in our case, we all knew that we had to do something massive, we had to do something quick, but we also knew it was going to be far from perfect. In our haste in crafting this, we made it possible for many businesses that didn't need it at all to have access to those funds, and we don't have an unlimited checking account.

When we give money to support businesses that don't need it, we are going to have less money to give to those that truly do need it.

Unfortunately, what we are down to here with this unanimous consent request—we have been working in good faith with the sponsors of the House bill, with the Republican leadership. I reached out to the Democratic leader, saying that we are very close; I think we will probably be able to pass the House bill, with assurances, by unanimous consent, just not at this moment.

So, again, I appreciate their thoughts. I am really not disagreeing

with the fact that we have to do something. I want to do something as well. I just want to make sure that if we do put more money into this thing, it is not going to be flowing to businesses that don't need it, thereby denying those businesses that truly do need it in a more targeted fashion.

So, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I respect the good faith and sincerity in my colleague from Wisconsin.

I would say this: If we change this bill and then go to conference with the House, we risk too much delay. We should move the bill now. We are willing to, certainly, look at the changes that my colleague from Wisconsin proposes, and we can do that in a UC tomorrow, next week, whenever—but not hold this bill up because, even if the Senator is right in his interpretation—which may be right; it may be wrong—it doesn't affect 95 percent of the businesses in the next few weeks that need help.

So we ought to pass this bill, help the urgent needs that those businesses have, and whatever corrections that my colleague from Wisconsin wishes to make, I am sure my colleagues from Maryland and New Hampshire and I would look at it. But to hold this bill up now, which passed 417 to 1 in the House and which does so many good and needed things, unaffected by the provision that he is having trouble with, I think would be a sincere mistake.

So I would ask him to reconsider. We need to pass this bill today.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the Democratic leader yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. What we are working on is not a change to this legislation. The way we are working this we will still be able to pass this piece of legislation unamended, unchanged, with a letter of intent from the chairs and the ranking members of the Small Business Committees of both the House and the Senate—together with a commitment from the majority leader—and we can pass this as-is.

We don't have to delay it. We are just this close. I am objecting at this time. Give us a little bit more time to work out that method, and then we will be able to pass this measure without amendment—no changes—pass this and then work in good faith together to make those changes I think we all agree need to be changed in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Will my colleague from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON. Sure.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Do I understand that you think you will have some resolution of this by this afternoon, so you expect at that point to come back in with another UC request to pass this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. With cooperation from the chairmen and the ranking members of both committees, I think we will be able to get this thing done.

Again, our request is really very simple. I am not the only one. We don't want to see this program automatically reauthorized until the end of December. Now, there is some dispute as to whether the language actually does that. It sounds like the intent was not to do that; it was just to allow people to spend money through the end of December, which we have no problem with.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. That is my understanding of the bill; it doesn't allow you to apply for the loan through December.

Mr. JOHNSON. So, again, CRS actually interprets it as a full authorization, so we just need to show what that true intent is, put that letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that we are certain that we are not reauthorizing this or authorizing it through December 31; that the authorization does end June 30 so that, if we do want to put more funds into a program like PPP, that new program will have the type of directed reforms that I think we really could gain agreement on.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague. I would simply say that it seems to me he has it a little backward.

We should pass this bill and then work on the changes—not hold this bill up. Who knows what can happen? Maybe it will happen today; maybe it will not. We have the moment to do it now. We waited 2½ days. We could have done the UC Monday. We waited until Wednesday afternoon. We are leaving here tomorrow at about 1.

The House is not in session now. It would be very, very wise and helpful to small business—and I have talked to many of them all across the country—to pass this bill now, and then we will work in good faith on the small change that my colleague wished to have.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. The way we are working this out, there would be no change required, just a letter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD stating what I believe the intent was, just to allow people to spend to the end of December. We are just working out the details of that language, and then we will be able to allow this to pass by unanimous consent.

By the way, I have gotten other Members who are objecting to this to agree to this as well.

So just give us a little bit more time; agree to that language. Hopefully, the ranking member would agree with that letter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Pass this bill, unchanged. Then, in the future—because this PPP will expire June 30, but the need does not.

If you read my article in the Wall Street Journal, I have a number of, I

think, innovative ideas for what we can do to help restore capital for businesses that are going to need it to reopen our economy, and I would love to work very closely.

I obviously have experience in businesses and small businesses and would like to work with the chairman and ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. If the Senator would yield, he has mentioned several different issues. I appreciate the fact that we are trying to get this done today and that he is indicating we have a path forward to get this completed this afternoon and the House bill to the President, which is our objective, so that small business owners understand—24 weeks before their loans expire and understand the additional flexibility on how they can spend the money because they are making those decisions, literally, today.

The Senator mentioned several different issues that he is concerned about, but it appears that the one area in which he is seeking consensus here deals with the authority to issue a loan under the PPP program through June of this year, which is what the law is, and I don't believe it is changed by the House bill. Is that the issue for which you are seeking to get consensus from the ranking member and chairman?

Mr. JOHNSON. I believe so. Again, there is a dispute as to what the language actually says. Again, I have no problem with the full \$660 billion that has already been appropriated to be spent whenever. But I don't want to reauthorize the program past June 30 without the types of reforms that we can talk about. Then we will pass it through regular order.

What I am suggesting here is to just wait until we have this letter of intent for the RECORD. We are just asking the chairman or ranking member of the Small Business Committees of both houses to agree to and sign, and then we will pass this bill as-is, unchanged, to give those small businesses the certainty we want to provide them.

Mr. CARDIN. I am just trying to figure out what I am supposed to be signing as ranking member of the committee. If I understand—because the Senator had mentioned problems with the 60 percent—

Mr. JOHNSON. We will deal with those in the future.

Mr. CARDIN. I just want to make sure we have—

Mr. JOHNSON. I have no demands other than one—again, we are so close. We are first working it out on our side, and then we will consult you, and maybe we will pass it yet tonight or early tomorrow morning. That is my goal as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, if my friend from Wisconsin is willing to delay the other changes he wants and

try to work those out, it would make eminent sense to delay this one, as well, and try to work that out and pass this bill. You never know what happens.

We should pass it today, not wait for tomorrow. We should pass it now, not wait a few hours. Lord knows what can happen. Businesses are crying out.

I think our moving here will move the process forward. It wouldn't have moved as quickly as if we didn't move the bill, but it is still a better bet to help small businesses, even with the concern my colleague has, to pass this bill now.

I would make one final plea: Let's pass it now. If not, we should pass it today.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am happy to come back or let you come back and ask for unanimous consent if we get this hammered out, and I will not object. But, at this point, I am going to object until we get this hammered out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today as the United States of America, again, faces the enormous challenge and responsibility of striving to live up to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States.

The preamble provides: "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

I note that our Founders, who were far from perfect when it came to racial issues, thought that justice was more important than domestic tranquility. They listed justice first.

Today, America is grieving over the brutal and unnecessary death of George Floyd in Minneapolis on May 25. Both State and Federal law enforcement officers are moving quickly to bring the police officers in this case to justice and hold them accountable for their actions, as Mr. Floyd's cries of "I can't breathe" went unanswered as the life drained out of him.

Video taken by several witnesses show that George Floyd—who was Black and was unarmed—was handcuffed and pinned to the ground by a police officer who held his knee against Mr. Floyd's neck as he pleaded for his life. Mr. Floyd was on the ground, repeatedly telling the officer that he could not breathe. And despite the fact that bystanders are all heard on video begging the officer to relent, he did not remove his knee from Mr. Floyd's neck until after an ambulance arrived.

Eventually Mr. Floyd lost consciousness. He was pronounced dead after being transported to a local hospital.

As leaders, regardless of party, we cannot stay silent about George

Floyd's death. Black lives matter. George Floyd was a father, a son, and a brother. His life mattered. He did not need to die. He and his family deserve justice. How many other Black men and women have died at the hands of law enforcement or vigilante civilians due to the color of their skin but have not been caught on video? Those victims deserve justice too.

We must act, working together, to fundamentally reform the ways police across this Nation interact with the communities they serve.

On Monday night, President Trump once again failed to lead this Nation in a time of crisis, and he has forfeited his moral authority as President. Spraying tear gas at peaceful protesters to clear a path for a photo op is opposite of American values and basic human rights. It violates civil and human rights under any circumstances.

President Trump fans the flames of racism and seeks to divide Americans for political purposes, just as he did in Charlottesville and far too many places since. He seems willfully blind to the reason people are protesting in the first place—to end systematic racism in the repeated and tragic targeting of Blacks by law enforcement.

Congress, finally, must act to pass a comprehensive plan to reform police community relations, improve training and hiring of police officers, and hold police accountable for misconduct and use of excessive force. We must rebuild trust between the police and the communities they serve.

For those who are asking "Why did it take so long?" the answer is "We have been trying." It should not have taken so long, but year after year too many of my colleagues have put partisanship before justice and equality.

As both the House and Senate prepare to hold hearings on police reform and racial profiling issues, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention two pieces of legislation that I have filed: The End Racial and Religious Profiling Act and the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act. If enacted, these two bills could make an enormous difference and constitute a giant step forward in reforming police departments in America and rebuilding trust between police officers and the communities they are sworn to protect and serve.

The End Racial and Religious Profiling Act is designed to enforce the constitutional right to equal protection under the law by eliminating racial profiling at all levels of law enforcement by changing the policies and procedures underlying the practice.

First, the bill provides a prohibition on racial profiling, enforceable by declaratory or injunctive relief. It creates a standard definition of racial profiling, which now includes religion, gender, and other protected categories for Federal, State, and local law enforcement, enforcing criminal, civil, and immigration laws.

Can law enforcement still provide a detailed description of a suspect that

includes race? The answer is yes. But the bill prohibits blanket targeting solely based on race or one of the other protected categories.

This bill also mandates training on racial profiling issues as part of Federal law enforcement training, the collection of data on all routine and spontaneous investigatory activities, and the creation of procedures for receiving, investigating, and responding meaningfully to complaints alleging racial profiling by law enforcement.

Systematic racism will not disappear overnight. We must engage all law enforcement in aggressive training and then have data to show where there is progress and where challenges remain. Our bill authorizes the Department of Justice grants for the development and implementation of best policing practices.

The second bill is the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act that I have filed. The Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act takes a comprehensive approach at addressing the issue of police accountability and building trust between police departments and their communities.

This legislation provides incentives for local police organizations to voluntarily adopt performance-based standards to ensure that instances of misconduct will be minimized through appropriate management, training, and oversight protocols. The bill provides that if such incidents do occur, they will be properly investigated.

The bill provides police officers—the vast majority of whom perform their job professionally, putting their lives on the line daily, protecting their communities—with the tools necessary to improve community relations and enhance their professional growth and education.

It authorizes \$25 million for additional expenses related to the enforcement of civil rights statutes, including compliance with consent decrees or judgments regarding police misconduct brought by the Department of Justice.

In Baltimore City, for example, the Baltimore Police Department voluntarily entered into a consent decree in 2017 with the U.S. Department of Justice to overhaul the police department. An earlier Department of Justice report had found a widespread pattern and practice of illegal and unconstitutional conduct by the Baltimore Police Department through targeting African-American residents for disproportionate and disparate treatment.

The legislation I have authored also authorizes appropriations for additional expenses related to conflict resolution, including programs managed by the Department of Justice's Community Relations Services within the Civil Rights Division.

I am pleased that, to date, the protests in Baltimore have been largely peaceful, especially compared to 2015 after the death of Freddie Gray in Baltimore Police Department custody.

I do hope my fellow Americans look to Baltimore in 2020 as an example for

how to peacefully protest and petition the government for redress of grievances, as Baltimore has willingly agreed to work with the U.S. Department of Justice to overhaul its entire police force so that policing its citizens is both fair and effective.

As many of my colleagues have said before, "Civil Rights is still the unfinished business of America." Prejudice, discrimination, and outright racism continues to limit the lives of the large number of our people. We must continue the struggle today in order to make urgent progress.

As I close, I am reminded of my dear friend, the late Representative Elijah Cummings, who died last year. He was a fellow Baltimorean and fellow graduate of the University of Maryland Law School. He gave the eulogy for Freddie Gray in 2015, who died after being arrested and taken into police department custody.

During the church service, he closed with a quote from the Book of Amos:

I want justice, oceans of it. I want fairness, rivers of it. That's what I want. That's all I want.

Elijah also asked a pointed question of those of us at the funeral that day, as well as to the news cameras that were broadcasting the event nationally and around the world. Elijah asked: "Did anyone recognize Freddie when he was alive . . . did anyone see him?"

Elijah asked whether society had done all that it could have done when Gray was "struggling to simply be all God meant for him to be?"

Today, I ask my fellow Americans to ask that question when it comes to the lives of not only George Floyd but Tony McDade, Sean Reed, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery. I say here today to Black Americans: I see you. I hear you. You are men and women. You have families. You have the same rights as every other individual in this country.

In a 2019 interview with "60 Minutes," Steve Kroft noted as follows:

Cummings is not a patient man. It's a lesson he learned from his late grandmother, who imparted her mindset shortly before she died. White people, she told him, had been telling African Americans to wait—and he shouldn't.

She says, "Your daddy, he been waiting and waiting and waiting for a better day," Cummings recalled. She said, "He's going to wait, and he's going to die." She said, "Don't you wait."

Then, in his late sixties, Elijah Cummings said that when he looks into the future, he also reflects on his life. "I realized that with African American people, where we've been blocked from being all that God meant for us to be, I don't have time to be patient."

Yes, Elijah often said of America that "we are better than this." Let's prove Elijah right. I urge the Senate not to be patient any longer and wait for the next death of an African American in police custody before taking action. Let us hold our hearings and then expeditiously take up and pass legislation, including the two bills I have explained on the floor today, as the next

steps in establishing justice in our still imperfect Union.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks before the vote occurs.

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, since the Federal Bureau of Investigation launched the Crossfire Hurricane counterintelligence investigation in July of 2016, there has been no shortage of media coverage of Russia's involvement in our 2016 election. For the better part of 3 years, there has been news; there has been speculation; there have been rumors; there have been partisan accusations made about that topic.

Trying to keep up with the names and the dates, the allegations left you feeling like an old-school detective show—names and photos pinned to a board, with strings of yarn connecting all the pieces. Everyone expected the release of the special counsel's report to be the moment when those dots were finally connected and it explained what happened and who was responsible.

It is safe to say that did not happen. Even though the Mueller report did not find any collusion or obstruction, there was a lot of information that since has been made public about its origins, its motivation, and the means by which that investigation occurred. In fact, rather than settling the matter, these revelations have prompted a whole new range of questions about the investigation itself.

First of all, we had Rod Rosenstein in the Judiciary Committee. He was the Deputy Attorney General. I asked him whether he was aware of any precedent for what happened in 2016 when, at the same time, both major parties' political nominees for President of the United States were the subject of open FBI investigations. He said: No, there is no precedent for that.

First, of course, it was the Hillary email scandal, after which Director Comey made another unprecedented move and had a press conference saying that even though she had been essentially grossly negligent in handling this private email server, he thought that no reasonable prosecutor would bring charges against her.

As much as Secretary Clinton might have appreciated that announcement, or not, a few weeks later, the FBI Director wrote another letter and said: Hey, we have some Anthony Weiner emails that came up on his laptop, so we need to reopen the investigation just a few days before the general election.

Well, you can imagine Secretary Clinton didn't appreciate that. Many people have said that it is because of the FBI's unprecedented involvement in the middle of a Presidential election that it damaged, if not decided, the election in 2016.

And then, of course, there is the Trump-Russia influence investigation, better known as Crossfire Hurricane, leading up to the Mueller investigation and where we are today. In the time since the special counsel completed his investigation and issued his report more than a year ago, we have learned more about the behind-the-scenes work that guided the Russia probe.

Thanks to Inspector General Horowitz and his team at the Department of Justice, thanks to the DNI, the Director of National Intelligence, and others for declassifying important information, we have a whole lot more insight and transparency into exactly what happened. But these revelations have given all of us pause for grave concern. They have highlighted a pattern of sloppiness and outright abuse of power at the highest levels of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and beyond and raised red flags that must be addressed.

In the Senate, it is our duty to get to the bottom of how and why this happened. I can't imagine any Democrat, any Republican, any American saying what happened in the 2016 election to Hillary Clinton and to Donald Trump was OK. Our law enforcement agencies should not play a starring role in an election leading up to the Nation's highest office.

This morning, the first step in our investigation into the origins, means, and methods of the Crossfire Hurricane investigation occurred in the Judiciary Committee. That is where we heard from Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein. He wasn't the Deputy Attorney General until the spring of 2017, but he did play a key role in the investigation. He signed one of the applications for the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act warrant that allowed the FBI to essentially surveil an American citizen. He was the one who appointed Special Counsel Bob Mueller. He ended up being not only an investigator but also a witness in the process.

His account of what happened in the Crossfire Hurricane investigation is important to understanding both the actions and the motivations that drove that investigation. In fact, he said this morning, in response to Chairman LINDSEY GRAHAM's question, if you knew then what you know now, would you have signed, sworn to this verified application for a warrant to surveil an American citizen, Carter Page? He said: No. To his credit, he said no. "If I knew then, what I know now."

Some of my greatest concerns stem from the Department of Justice Inspector General's report about those FISA abuses, as they are called—Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. This is extraordinary authority given by Congress under very strict rules, and they are supervised by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which was established to provide oversight of these surveillance activities, including surveillance of American citizens under very narrow and restricted guardrails.

If the U.S. intelligence authorities, or law enforcement agencies, believe surveillance is critical to a national security investigation, they submit an application to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to receive that authorization. This is an important step in protecting the rights of American citizens and making sure that our intelligence and law enforcement authorities perform their job consistent with congressional intent and direction. But these verified, in other words, sworn documents are critical, in which accuracy is paramount. That is why they are required to be verified—that is, sworn to—by the top officials at the Department of Justice.

We now know that the applications of the former Trump campaign aide Carter Page were riddled with errors. In the initial Carter Page FISA application, Inspector General Horowitz identified what he called seven mistakes. In the three renewals, he had found an additional 10. These weren't necessarily honest mistakes. In fact, they included significant and material errors, including the deliberate falsification, lying—lying to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court about Carter Page's past service to the U.S. Government.

To make matters worse, even as new and exculpatory material came to light, this information was not reflected in renewal applications. It was sort of a cut-and-paste job. Those agents who prepared those materials that were signed by people like Rod Rosenstein lied to deceive the court so they could continue to surveil, or spy, on an American citizen—something we do not want to happen unless they are truly an agent of a foreign power and there is probable cause to show that they are such.

These revelations were very troubling in December of 2019, and they are just as troubling today. It does also raise questions about the motivations for the investigation, in the first place. Falsifying a FISA application is clearly not an action one would take if you were in pursuit of the truth. We need to know why the initial application and three renewals were riddled with lies and omissions and how these inaccurate applications were approved by high-ranking officials at the Department of Justice.

Second, this raises serious questions about the way investigations of average Americans are being handled. If these agents were able to break every rule in the book to spy on a Presidential candidate—who ultimately was elected—and are facing no consequences, no accountability, what protections exist for the rest of us in America? Who is going to notice their error-ridden FISA applications if it is John or Jane Q. Public?

What is even more disconcerting is, if this happened once—and it did happen more than once—what is to stop it from happening again? The American people need and deserve answers to

these questions, and today's hearing in the Judiciary Committee was the first step in getting the answers to those questions and hopefully corrective action.

Chairman GRAHAM has been clear that we will look at this investigation from all angles—covering the FISA abuses, unmasking requests, and the origins of both Crossfire Hurricane, and the appointment of special counsel.

The trove of declassified transcripts that recently were released by the House Intelligence Committee—actually, declassified by the Director of National Intelligence—only underscores the important need for oversight by the Senate and by the Congress. In reading these transcripts, which were taken in secret, in a secure facility, and only recently made public, I have been shocked at some of the statements made by former Obama administration officials.

Based on the way Chairman SCHIFF repeatedly claimed to have direct evidence, you would think these officials would provide the smoking gun to the committee. But no—witness after witness confirmed they had no evidence of collusion, coordination, or conspiracy between anyone in the Trump campaign and Russia. What did they do? They walked outside of that secure facility, and they spoke to the TV cameras assembled there, and they lied. They misrepresented what was said during that classified testimony.

This really begs the question: Why did this investigation begin and how, without evidence, did it last for nearly 2 years?

Additionally, I have a lot of questions about the sloppy and incomplete investigative work surrounding Crossfire Hurricane when it came to the use of something called a confidential human source.

Christopher Steele, former intelligence officer from the United Kingdom, was hired by Fusion GPS to do opposition research against the Trump campaign for the Hillary Clinton campaign. Yet, at the same time, he was considered by the FBI as a confidential human source.

Inspector General Horowitz's report makes clear Mr. Steele and his FBI handler did not even agree on the terms of their arrangement. Steele said: I am a businessman collecting information. The FBI said: Well, this is just between us, and you can't talk to the public, which he clearly did, and he did so at the same time he was supposed to be a confidential human source.

The FBI background check into Christopher Steele was so sloppy, they didn't even understand that his loyalties were not with the FBI and the U.S. Government, they were with his paymaster—Fusion GPS, his employer. That is one reason there were such inaccuracies throughout this investigation, including in the FISA applications.

So we need answers, and we need accountability. Based on what I have

seen so far, one conclusion is that there was a coordinated effort to manipulate our intelligence community and justice system for vindictive and biased purposes against a Presidential candidate and elected President of the United States. I realize that this is a grave and serious charge, but I think it is one conclusion you could draw based on what we know.

It is high time we learned the truth. If this kind of misbehavior and deception becomes routine, it will jeopardize important legal authorities that we rely on to protect our national security. It is counter to our values and is a direct blow to the foundation of our democracy.

I appreciate Chairman GRAHAM's prioritizing these oversight hearings. I know we have a lot of work to do in order to restore public confidence in our justice system as well as in our intelligence community—the people charged with protecting the American people. We need to learn what really happened so we can make sure this never ever, ever happens again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Tipton nomination?

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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. CRAMER). Are there any other Senator in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 111 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Harris	Reed
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	Jones	Sinema
Cardin	Kaine	Stabenow
Carper	King	Udall
Casey	Leahy	Van Hollen
Coons	Manchin	Warner
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	

NOT VOTING—7

Burr	Sanders	Tester
Klobuchar	Schatz	
Markey	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 actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

IMMIGRANT HEALTHCARE HEROES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Americans owe a great debt of gratitude to the healthcare heroes on the frontlines of the fight against the COVID-19 virus.

Today I would like to spend a minute talking about one special group of those healthcare workers: immigrants.

Consider this: One out of every six healthcare and social service workers in America is an immigrant—3 million out of 18 million immigrants. They are playing a critical role in the battle against the pandemic. Yet our broken immigration laws do not allow many of them to fulfill their dreams of actually becoming Americans.

I have come to the floor today to tell the story of one of our immigrant healthcare heroes. I will continue to highlight these stories in the coming weeks. There has been so much negative publicity about immigrants. Yet, when you follow what is happening in hospitals across America—large and small, rural and urban—and so many times you ask “Doctor, where were you born?” you find they weren't born in the United States, but they came here to practice medicine, and now their work is saving lives every day.

I invite my colleagues and others to share stories from their own communities and their own States and to use the social media hashtag “Immigrant Health Heroes.”

Thousands of immigrant health workers are suffering because of a serious problem in our immigration system. It is called the green card backlog. If you are not in immigrant status, you may not know anything about it, but trust me, they do.

This backlog puts them and their families at risk of losing their immigration status, and it hinders their ability to join in the fight against COVID-19. Under current law, there are not nearly enough immigrant visas—also known as green cards—available each year. As a result, many immigrants in the United States are stuck

in crippling backlogs, not just for years but for decades. Close to 5 million future Americans—close to 5 million—are in line waiting for green cards. Hundreds of thousands are working in the United States on a temporary visa while many more are waiting abroad, separated from their American families.

Only 226,000 family green cards and 140,000 employment green cards are available each year. The backlogs are a real hardship on these families caught in immigration limbo. For example, children in many of these families age out and face deportation. While their parents are waiting for the green card, the child reaches the age where they are deported, at age 21.

The green card backlog includes thousands of doctors currently working in the United States on temporary visas. These doctors face many restrictions due to their temporary status, such as not being able to take shifts at hospitals in COVID-19 hotspots where they may be desperately needed.

The solution to the green card backlog is very clear: Increase the number of green cards.

In 2013, I joined a group of four Republicans and four Democrats who authored bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform legislation. Our bill, which passed the Senate on a strong bipartisan 68-to-32 vote, would have eliminated this green card backlog.

Last year I introduced the RELIEF Act, legislation based on the 2013 comprehensive immigration reform bill, which would clear the backlogs for all immigrants waiting in line for green cards within 5 years. I will keep fighting to help these immigrants here in the United States who simply want a chance to continue to serve this Nation.

Last month I joined with my colleagues—Senators PERDUE of Georgia, YOUNG of Indiana, CORNYN of Texas, COONS of Delaware, and LEAHY of Vermont—to introduce legislation to quickly address the plight of immigrant doctors and nurses stuck in this green card backlog.

This backlog poses a significant risk to our ability to effectively respond to this pandemic. Our bill, the Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act, is a temporary stopgap effort that will strengthen our healthcare workforce and improve healthcare for Americans in the midst of this national emergency.

Our bill would reallocate 25,000 unused immigrant visas for nurses and 15,000 unused immigrant visas for doctors. These are visas that Congress has previously authorized but were not used.

It is important to note that our bill requires employers to attest to a very important fact. They have to attest that immigrants from overseas who receive these visas will not displace an American worker. We want to ensure that the beneficiaries of this bill help build our workforce but not at the ex-

pense of those already here in the United States.

Our bill now has 13 Republican and 13 Democratic cosponsors and broad support from the medical community. As Congress works on the next legislation to address the COVID-19 pandemic, I am going to join my Republican colleagues and push for the Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act to be included.

Today, let me tell you the story of one immigrant healthcare worker stuck in this green card backlog waiting indefinitely, for years, and he would benefit from the Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act: Dr. Parth Mehta, born in India.

As a child, he was inspired to pursue a career in medicine by his grandfather, who worked as an assistant to a physician, and by his older sister, who is a surgeon.

Dr. Mehta came to the United States in the year 2004. He has been here 16 years. He obtained a master's in public health at Saint Xavier University in the city of Chicago. He then completed his residency in internal medicine at St. Joseph's Hospital in Chicago.

In 2010, 10 years ago, Dr. Mehta began working as a hospitalist at UnityPoint Health Methodist Medical Center in downstate Peoria, IL.

He sent me a letter, and here is what he says about being a doctor:

I feel that it is a great privilege to help people, comforting them, healing them, and making them better when they are most vulnerable.

Dr. Mehta lives in Peoria with his wife and his 10-year-old son and 4-year-old daughter, and he writes, in addition:

We have called Peoria home for 10 years now and we love our community here. We have bought a home here, built a career here, and we plan to stay in this community as long as we can.

Now Dr. Mehta is on the frontlines of the pandemic, treating COVID-19 patients. He was also selected as the principal investigator for a COVID-19 trial for which the hospital has applied, but unfortunately, Dr. Mehta is one of thousands of doctors who are stuck in this green card backlog. He has been on a temporary work visa for 13 years. He has been forced to renew his visa four times since he became a doctor. His green card petition was filed in 2011, but he will have to wait years and years and years before he receives a green card.

In the midst of this pandemic, Dr. Mehta's immigration status puts him at great risk. If, God forbid, he contracts COVID-19 and becomes disabled or dies, his family would immediately lose their immigration status and be forced to leave the United States.

Dr. Mehta has written goodbye letters to his wife and kids and prepared an emergency binder with all the necessary information for his family if he dies. To keep his family safe, Dr. Mehta has isolated himself by living in the basement of his home. He is espe-

cially worried about his wife, who has asthma. In March, she was diagnosed with pneumonia and was hospitalized for 10 days, including a stay in the intensive care unit.

Here is what Dr. Mehta wrote to me about this:

Seeing COVID patients, treating them, taking care of them, and saving their lives is part of my job, and I will never shy away from doing my job. But how is it fair that my family gets no protection if I die doing my job?

Dr. Mehta's story makes it clear why Congress needs to pass the Healthcare and Workforce Resilience Act. Under our bill, Dr. Mehta and thousands of others like him could receive their green cards. They and their families would get the permanent immigration status they deserve and be able to use their skills to serve on the frontlines of the pandemic, where they are needed most.

Don't put a sign in the window saying that you love healthcare workers, don't come out at 7 at night and beat on a pan to show that you care for healthcare workers and ignore the reality that this man in Peoria, IL, is risking his life every day to treat those patients, and we have written a law that says you are basically not welcome in the United States.

How can we say this to him, to thousands just like him, doctors and nurses who are really caring for the people we love and risking their own lives in the process?

It would be great, in these times of political division, if we could come together in this Congress to quickly aid these immigrant healthcare heroes.

The bill that I have introduced with Senator PERDUE, Senator YOUNG, and others is a step toward reality, toward realizing that people just like these make us a better nation and a stronger nation.

Dr. Mehta and his family, with all their fears, should know that there are many here in Congress, particularly here in the Senate, who want to move as quickly as possible and make sure that their lives are better because they have done so much to make the lives of others better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

HONORING NATE LYDAY

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is with a very heavy heart that I stand today in

the Senate to talk about the death of two Americans last week. One tragedy is tearing our communities apart. The other may well show us a path back toward unity.

We all know about the brutal, senseless killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis last Monday. There is no excuse for what the police did to Mr. Floyd. His killers are being brought to justice.

His death, we hope, will not be remembered for the senseless violence launched falsely in his name but, rather, hopefully, in the long-term reform of policing policies across our country.

In my home State of Utah, the city of Ogden is mourning another death, that of Police Officer Nate Lyday.

On Thursday, May 28, a woman called 9-1-1 saying that her husband was threatening her life. Lyday and a group of officers arrived promptly at the house. The man began shooting at them from inside the home. Lyday was mortally wounded.

He was just 24 years old. He was about to celebrate his fifth wedding anniversary with his wife Ashley.

He had been on the job as a police officer for just 15 months. By all accounts, he did that job honorably and completely up to the last moment. Nate Lyday was an officer who sought to uphold justice and protect the innocent, even making the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of a threatened and fearful family.

Nate Lyday was a “son of Ogden,” as Police Chief Randy Watt said. Ogden was where he was born and raised, where he went to high school, and where he worked on a regular basis at the Fresh Market on 20th Street and where he got his degree in criminal justice from Weber State University.

And it was where he was proud to serve and protect his community as a sworn police officer. According to Lieutenant Brian Eynon, Lyday was an officer who “worked over and above the call of duty.” Eynon said that whenever he passed Lyday in the hallways, the young officer would always smile at him, even before he had a chance to smile first.

As his colleagues, his friends, and his classmates remember him, Nate Lyday made everyone around him feel like a friend, no matter how well they knew him because they were indeed his friends.

This Saturday, while far too many other communities throughout our Nation were tearing themselves apart, Ogden came together. Hundreds of Ogden residents gathered near the front steps of the Ogden Municipal Building to honor the memory of George Floyd and to call for nationwide police reform.

But this was not a divisive event designed to make everyone choose sides between police and protesters. As Malik Dayo, an Ogden activist and organizer, said that day:

This is a peaceful protest. . . . This is not an anti-cop rally. This is a solidarity rally.

The protesters at the event honored George’s memory, they condemned racism, and they called for policing reforms. They also thanked the officers who were there, the same officers there protecting them and protecting their First Amendment rights to speak freely and gather peacefully. And they honored the memory of Officer Lyday, who lost his life answering the call of duty just a few days before.

“I gave them my condolences for their fallen officer—our fallen officer—because we’re all part of the same community,” Dayo said of the police after the protest.

And Dayo is right. Nate Lyday’s loss is our loss. George Floyd’s loss is our loss. And we ought to honor and remember them both.

We must all work to uphold justice for all. Both of these tragic, horrific deaths last week show us just how far we still have to go to achieve this goal. It is work that must be undertaken by each and every one of us, each and every day. We cannot do that work by pitting ourselves against one another—race versus race, police versus protester.

We will never move forward if we continue to reduce human beings to the color of their skin or the color of their uniform. We are all one Nation, and it will only be in standing and in working together, in peaceful solidarity, that we can finally heal the wounds in our Nation.

What the people of Ogden did this weekend is an example for us all. And it is a reason for hope.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

THE GULF OF MEXICO

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk for a few minutes today about the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Great American Outdoors Act, and fairness.

Let me start with the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act—GOMESA, as you know.

Louisianians started drilling off our coast in the Gulf of Mexico in the 1930s. They were Louisiana people, Louisiana companies. There were some other States represented, as well, but they were primarily Louisiana companies.

A lot of people laughed at us, said it can’t be done: We know you can drill for oil and natural gas and supply the country’s energy needs by onshore production, but offshore, man, you are dreaming.

We did it. Then we did it again and we did it again and we did it again.

All of a sudden, the Federal Government said: Huh, there is money to be had. And the Federal Government came in and said: Louisiana, you can’t do that anymore. We own all the land under the oceans and the Gulf of Mexico.

Well, predictably, Louisiana disagreed. We went to court. After 30

years of litigation, Louisiana lost. The courts ended up ruling that Louisiana owns the land in the gulf from its coastline out to 3 miles, and the Federal Government owns the rest. And the Federal Government owns the rest. That is a little bit of oversimplification but not much.

I always thought that was unfair. For example, Texas, our sister State—I love Texas—owns from its coastline 10 miles out. We only own 3 miles out.

More oil and gas wells were drilled in the Gulf of Mexico. It became one of the major—if not the major—sources of oil and natural gas for energy needs of America up to the point that we were producing and still are producing about \$5 billion that goes right into the Treasury of the United States of America.

In 2006, Congress passed GOMESA. Thank you, Congress, for doing this. GOMESA said that the Federal Government is going to start sharing some of those oil and gas royalties. We are not going to share all of them. We are just going to share the oil and gas royalties from lands under the ocean in the Gulf of Mexico for all future leases after 2006—not past leases, only future leases. Here is the new deal, according to Congress. On all these new leases drilled after 2006, the U.S. Treasury will take 50 percent of oil and gas royalties. The gulf-producing States will take 37.5 percent. By the gulf-producing States, I mean Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, and Alabama. And 12.5 percent of the oil and gas royalties from these new leases—not old leases, these new leases—will go to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I will come back to the Land and Water Conservation Fund in a moment.

Keep in mind, I said that under GOMESA, Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, and Mississippi share in 37.5 percent of all the oil and gas royalties from the new leases, not the old leases. But the amount that we are entitled to receive is capped.

To give you an idea of the money we are talking about, in 2019, the four Gulf producing States received about \$350 million in offshore oil and gas royalties. Louisiana received \$155 million of that \$350 million. There is a formula that apportions the money between and among the four gulf-producing States.

GOMESA caps, in a fairly complicated formula, the amount the gulf-producing States can receive under GOMESA at \$375 million. Our four States will hit that cap in 2024. It doesn’t matter how much drilling increases in the Gulf of Mexico, the four gulf-producing States can only receive \$375 million, split among themselves, until, I think, 2055.

Other States not located on coastlines also have Federal lands on which oil and natural gas and coal and other minerals are produced. I am happy for them. They, as a result of congressional legislation—by “they” I mean those other States, 24 of them—get 50

percent of the royalties of all the oil and gas and coal and other minerals produced from Federal lands in their States. The Feds get 50 percent; the States get 50 percent.

I am happy for them. I couldn't be more pleased for my sister States. I wish we got 50 percent—"we" meaning the gulf-producing States. It seems unfair to me that we don't. We only get 37.5 percent on certain leases. Our sister States onshore get 50 percent of all leases. Their money isn't capped; ours is.

Let me talk about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. As you know, this is a fund that was set up in 1964. It had to be authorized every now and then. We made it permanent 2 years ago—"we" meaning, of course, Congress. The purpose of the Land and Water Conservation Fund is to take money appropriated by Congress and put it into that fund and use it to buy land and water to make that land and water public so that all Americans can enjoy it. I am supportive of that. I think most of us are.

The only money dedicated to the Land and Water Conservation Fund is that 12.5 percent I talked about dedicated to the fund through GOMESA. The other moneys that have been put into the fund through the years, other than the GOMESA moneys, have had to be appropriated by Congress on a year-to-year basis. Once again, I am supportive of the concept, and I am happy as a clam at high tide that my sister States out west get 50 percent. I just think it is unfair that we only get 37.5 percent.

As you know, we are going to consider a bill next week called the Great American Outdoors Act. Here is what it would do. No. 1, it will set up a dedicated automatic funding source for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. That dedicated source is going to come from oil and gas royalties produced in the Gulf of Mexico.

Remember, I told you that under GOMESA, the Federal Government automatically gets 50 percent of the royalties from the new leases. Henceforth, at least half of the 50 percent that is going into the Federal Treasury will now go into the Land and Water Conservation Fund. That is No. 1—permanent source of funding for the fund.

Some have argued that we are—I mean, we are not having to borrow this money, and that is a good thing. But this money didn't fall from Heaven. It is coming out of the moneys the U.S. Treasury would receive otherwise from oil and gas production offshore. That means if the Land and Water Conservation Fund takes this money from the share that goes to the Federal Government and uses it for the fund, somebody else is going to get screwed because the money is going to be taken from somebody else and given to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Great American Outdoors Act also does something else. It sets up another sort of separate fund that a good

bit of the oil and gas money is going to flow into for deferred maintenance on public lands that we already own. Of course, we all support that. I do. A lot of our parks are falling apart. I mean, they have roads that have holes big enough for a Mack truck to fall through. They have a backlog of deferred maintenance of \$12 billion. And we are going to dedicate some money to try to chip away at that deferred maintenance. That is a good thing too.

Here is what we end up with. We end up with a lot of our States getting 50 percent of all of the oil and gas and coal produced in their State with no cap. Now these States that have national parks—again, I am happy for them; I love national parks—they are going to get an extra big slug of money from the Gulf of Mexico. In the meantime, the gulf-producing States—primarily Louisiana, but also Texas, Alabama, Mississippi—we are going to be stuck at 37.5 percent. It is capped. It is capped. It is capped at a weeny \$375 million a year from now until 2055. With inflation, by 2055, it will be worth about 7 bucks and 23 cents.

That doesn't seem fair to me. It especially doesn't seem fair to me when you consider that basically the Gulf of Mexico is producing the money—actually, oil companies are. But how do the oil companies do that? They do it with Louisiana. Most of the leases and wells are off Louisiana's coast. I am not putting down Mississippi, Alabama, or Texas because there is drilling off their coast as well. But facts are facts. Most of the drilling is off Louisiana's coast. A lot of the workers are from Louisiana.

Do you know what makes that drilling possible? Louisiana tax dollars. We pay for the roads that support Port Fourchon, which is vital and located in my State for that oil and gas production. We pay for the schools that educate the kids of the workers. We take all the risk.

We know what happened with the BP oilspill. If there is another oilspill in the Gulf, it is Louisiana and Texas and Alabama and Mississippi that are going to get slammed. It is not going to be the inland States. That is where I said I am going to talk about fairness.

Senator CASSIDY—and I don't see speak for Senator CASSIDY. Understand, he is my senior Senator. But he and I are working on a way to improve the Great American Outdoors Act. It is going to make it so much better.

I am introducing a bill tomorrow, and I am going to offer an amendment to the Great American Outdoors Act—once again, I don't speak for Senator CASSIDY, but I think he will support it—that is going to remove the cap on the amount of oil and gas royalties that the four gulf-producing States can receive under GOMESA.

Let me say it again. Right now, nobody else is capped. We are capped. The most that Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas can receive, split among ourselves, is \$375 million. We

are going to hit that cap in 2024, and it will remain until 2055. We all know with inflation it is not going to be worth \$375 million in 2055. It is capped.

All I am saying and all Senator CASSIDY is saying, and I think—I don't speak for them either, but my colleagues from the gulf-producing States—all we are saying is: Let's be a little fair here. If you don't have a cap onshore, let's don't have a cap offshore. My little old amendment would just remove that cap and make the Great American Outdoors Act even greater.

Senator CASSIDY and I and other Senators from the gulf-producing States are also working on some other ideas that I don't feel comfortable talking about today, but we have some other ways we think we can improve the Great American Outdoors Act.

I wanted to come here today and say, once again, I am not criticizing any of my sister States. I am happy as I can be for all the States that don't have caps and that do get to share in 50 percent of the royalties. I am just asking for a little fairness and equity, just a little bit for the gulf-producing States by allowing us to remove that cap.

With that, I either yield the floor or I suggest the absence of a quorum, whichever the Parliamentarian tells me to do.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROTESTS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the past week, our Nation has been engulfed by protests in dozens of cities over the senseless murder of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor at the hands of police officers. Americans are angry, frustrated, and grieving, not just for Mr. Floyd's and Ms. Taylor's deaths but for centuries of injustice and brutality against African Americans. The instances are too numerous to count. Yet these instances of violence keep happening while meaningful reforms have not taken place.

The protests are set against the backdrop of the deadly novel coronavirus pandemic. As our country copes with this crisis, African-American communities have suffered disproportionately high infection and death rates. Compounding this tragedy, we are in the midst of an economic downturn that rivals the Great Depression, with communities of color bearing the brunt of the economic fallout. Millions of hard-working Americans have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. They are struggling to provide for their families, put food on their table, and keep a roof over their head.

These protests are not isolated. They are taking place in every State in the Nation and in many other countries. Protesters are of every race and ethnicity and run the gamut in age from high school and college students to parents and grandparents. The people participating in these protests represent the diversity that is the strength of America.

The overwhelming majority of these protests are emotional but nonviolent. They embrace a fundamental tenant of civil engagement, which is the American right and tradition of peacefully protesting to make their voices heard and to rectify injustice.

On the fringes of these peaceful protests, there are opportunists who are sowing mistrust and division. Their primary goal is to loot and destroy property, that cause chaos that puts innocent lives in harm's way. Let me state clearly, theft and looting are a crime. They are unacceptable and undermine the powerful message of thousands demanding justice and change. They offer an easy way out to those who would rather turn away from this challenge of justice and simply indulge in their own petty objectives of violence, diversion, and destruction.

Our Nation is in pain. We need leaders who bring calm, unity, empathy, and aid. Instead, our Nation has a President who treats it as a field of war. He does not even attempt to bring people together, to listen to others, or to accept the reality that leaders in a democracy are neither infallible nor omnipotent.

In a tweet on May 30, President Trump said:

Mayor Jacob Frey of Minneapolis will never be mistaken for the late, great Douglas McArthur or great fighter General George Patton. . . . Get tough and fight.

In a call with our Nation's Governors, Secretary of Defense Esper said: "I think the sooner that you mass and dominate the battlespace, the quicker this dissipates and we can get back to the right normal."

These are American city streets that we are talking about, filled with Americans exercising their rights, not battlefields filled with the enemy.

Then, in a statement in the White House Rose Garden on June 1, President Trump said: "If a city or a state refuses to take the actions that are necessary to defend the life and property of their residents, then I will deploy the United States military and quickly solve the problem for them." America learned shortly thereafter what actions the President was prepared to take. The U.S. Park Police and others near Lafayette Park used tear gas, flash-bang grenades, and rubber bullets to aggressively push back a peaceful crowd 30 minutes before the DC curfew went into effect.

Why was this assault undertaken? It wasn't to step inside St. John's Church and offer a prayer for George Floyd, his family, or the countless other Americans who have been victims of police

brutality. It wasn't to reflect on the pain and division that is rife within our country and contemplate what actions he could take to heal our Nation, like President Lincoln often did during the Civil War. The President crossed a street, aggressively cleared of peaceful protesters for a photo op that was meant to say he was strong, and he was in charge. Unfortunately, for him, it had the opposite effect.

President Trump's rhetoric and some of the events that have occurred are not ones that many of us ever thought we would see on American streets or hear from an American President. They are the words and actions that happen in authoritarian states, words and actions that past American Presidents have condemned. They are words and actions that violate the democratic norms our Nation has stood for and American servicemembers have died for.

While the President does have the authority to call up military personnel under the Insurrection Act, it does not mean he should. It was last invoked in 1992 when California Governor Pete Wilson requested Federal military assistance from President George Herbert Walker Bush to respond to the L.A. riots following the acquittal of police officers for the beating of Rodney King. Before that instance, the act was invoked in the 1950s and 1960s to enforce civil rights laws and end segregation in the South.

The Insurrection Act serves as an exception to posse comitatus and to the broad principle embedded deeply in American democracy and history that the Active Armed Forces should not be used to enforce State laws or to exercise police power reserved to the States unless absolutely necessary as a last resort. The act is, by design and tradition, rarely invoked.

The Insurrection Act envisions that, when Active military forces are used to supplement State police forces to enforce State laws, they do so only at the request of the Governor or legislature, which is ultimately responsible for the execution of the laws within the States. In the present moment, I am not aware of any Governor or legislature calling for the Federal Government to step in and take control. Put simply, if they need help, I have no doubt they will ask for it.

The President's ability to invoke the Insurrection Act without the Governor or State legislature requesting assistance rests on the need to enforce or protect Federal law, which is not the case here. If President Trump were to invoke the Insurrection Act today, absent a request from a State, it would only be to further his own political interests. He would be using Active military forces as a political and propaganda tool in contravention of everything our military stands for.

Using the Insurrection Act on a whim risks politicizing the military. The military's mission is to defend and serve the Constitution and the Amer-

ican people regardless of who is in office. Bringing the military into domestic politics risks a rupture in the sacred trust between the civilian and military leadership and undermines fundamental American values.

As former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff GEN Martin Dempsey stated shortly after the 2016 Presidential conventions, "If senior military leaders—active and retired—begin to self-identify as members or supporters of one party or another, then the inherent tension built into our system of government between the executive branch and the legislative branch will bleed over into suspicion of military leaders by Congress and a further erosion of civil-military relations."

Over the last few years, that erosion has increased steadily as recent events have made eminently clear. This erosion is a toxic force that will undermine one of the most essential ethics of the American military. Soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, and coastguardsmen serve the Constitution, not the President. That is the oath many of us took as young men and women. That is the oath that defines the military of the United States, unlike many other countries, fortunately, for us.

According to press reports, Secretary of Defense Esper told senior military leaders to "stay apolitical during these turbulent days," but I would urge Secretary Esper to heed his own advice. Traditionally, the Secretary of Defense, while a Cabinet member and appointed by the President, has taken a nonpolitical stand—staying away from campaign events and avoiding even the potential of a political photo op. As General Milley discovered Monday evening, once the civilian leader of the military joins the political fray, it is difficult for the military to stay neutral.

Our Nation is in crisis, but it is not a crisis that can or should be solved by American military force against its own citizens. I think, if you ask any young man or woman who took the oath to join the forces of the United States—whatever branch—was he or she doing it to go fight Americans, they would answer no. He or she is doing everything they can to protect Americans, to protect the system of government, and, ultimately, the Constitution. That is the oath we take.

The strength of this Nation and of the great American experiment in representative democracy goes far beyond our military strength. It goes to our civil traditions, our Constitution, our sense of civic responsibility, and our ability to constantly evolve and improve ourselves even from our earliest days stained with slavery. We need leaders who will listen and commit to change and then implement that change. We need leaders who will not exacerbate the problem but will seek to solve it and bring people together as our greatest Presidents have done throughout history. In short, we need leaders who are builders, not destroyers, and until those leaders emerge, I

am afraid the tumult will continue. It is my fervent hope that this Nation finds a way to peace soon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, back in March, as the coronavirus pandemic began to grip our country, the Senate's historic CARES Act set up the Paycheck Protection Program to help protect American workers from layoffs during the crisis.

Thanks especially to its chief architects, Senator RUBIO and Senator COLLINS, the PPP has literally saved tens of millions of American jobs. Our colleagues' bold policy has meant the mailboxes of working families in all 50 States have continued to bring people their regular paychecks instead of pink slips.

Through the end of May, this remarkable program has delivered more than half a trillion dollars to keep American workers on payroll all across our country.

One recent survey found that more than three-quarters—three-quarters—of all small business owners have applied for a PPP loan and more than 90 percent of those applicants have received one.

The Senate has always committed to standing behind this popular program. Back in April when it ran low on funds, we worked together to add more resources, and today we are passing another piece of legislation that makes a few targeted changes to the program.

To help workers and small businesses through these lengthy shutdowns that are just now beginning to ease, we are increasing the loan forgiveness period from 8 weeks to 6 months.

Since keeping workers on payroll obviously requires small businesses to stay afloat in the first place, we are expanding firms' ability to use these funds to meet obligations like their rent, their mortgage, or their utility bills, but we maintain the overall requirement to avoid layoffs to keep the strong protection for workers in place. And we are providing payroll tax deferral for the small businesses involved.

This is a bipartisan bill that passed the House overwhelmingly. I am proud the Senate is sending it on to the President's desk to become law.

I want to thank Senator COLLINS and Senator RUBIO once more for their leadership in authoring this historic program in the first place. They have kept right on with their essential leadership, carefully monitoring the policy as it has taken effect.

I know they have identified further technical fixes in addition to the issues we are addressing today, and I hope and anticipate the full Congress will look at addressing those as well in the future.

I also want to thank Senator DAINES, Senator TILLIS, and Senator GARDNER for their hard work on these modifications.

The Senate delivered for workers and small businesses when we first passed the CARES Act. We delivered again when we added more money to this popular program back in April, and we are delivering again today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is a very good day because very much needed improvements to the PPP program will now pass the Senate as they passed the House, 417 to 1. The PPP program is desperately needed by small business, and it was not in the original proposal of our Republican friends or of the President. We worked very hard and pushed hard to get this done, and I want to salute Senators CARDIN and SHAHEEN for their efforts.

The program was not at all perfect. When it first rolled out, too many of the big shots got money and not enough of the small businesses—the mom and pops, the butcher, baker, and candlestick maker. And nonprofits were not entitled. I pushed very hard to get nonprofits, including church-related nonprofits, religious-related nonprofits, in the bill. They can now benefit from the bill just like the small businesses can.

We Democrats said, there has to be some money set aside—not just to give more money in COVID 3.5—to the existing businesses that had connections with bankers but to the smaller businesses, and \$125 billion was set aside. That was a very good thing. Now it has changed from a program that has gone mainly to those that had good connections to bankers that were well connected to many smaller businesses as well.

In the second round, States that really needed the help got a greater percentage of the help, like my State of New York. So this program has been one that Democrats have been, initially, very positive about and helped propose and write but constantly worked on improving to make it better, better, and better. That improvement continues today. The House Democrats put together a bill that would deal with the kinds of problems we continue to see.

Eight weeks is running out soon. Yet small businesses may not get all the money—may not be able to use the money when the program runs out, and extending it to 24 weeks is vital. In many States, like mine in New York, only 25 percent of the money could go to OTSPS expenses, other than personnel expenses. That wasn't enough. A lot of businesses didn't want to apply.

This bill moves it up to 40. Our Republican friends had resisted that. I am glad now they have seen the light.

You will have the loan—if you go to convert your loans and get them forgiven, it will be 5 years that you have to pay back, not 2. Lots of small businesses said they couldn't dare be able to pay them back in 2. These are among the most important changes in the bill, as well as some others.

I am glad our Republican friends have relented and passed the bill here as we are about to close session for this week. It passed the House. We Democrats have been pushing to get it done. For the last 3 days, there were some problems on the other side, and I am glad they have been worked out. I want to thank Senator JOHNSON. He had problems, but we talked on the phone repeatedly and worked those problems out with the help of Senator CARDIN. And this is an improvement that is much needed and comes at the last minute but not too late. So many businesses—8 weeks—will expire so soon, and now it is extended to 24 weeks.

So I am glad this bill passes. I am glad we can do it by unanimous consent. We Democrats are fully in support of this, every Democrat. We have no problems moving it forward. I know it will help a lot of small businesses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2020

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 7010, which was received from the House.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7010) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to modify certain provisions related to the forgiveness of loans under the paycheck protection program, to allow recipients of loan forgiveness under the paycheck protection program to defer payroll taxes, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the good faith efforts of Senator JOHNSON to make sure the terms of the program and its legislative intent are properly understood. In addition, I commend his leadership in looking at the program overall, and making suggestions about reforms should Congress determine that additional money is needed in the future for the program. The program was designed intentionally to get money into the hands of small businesses quickly as government took the extraordinary and unprecedented step of shutting down the economy because of the pandemic. However, should we need to replenish the fund, he is absolutely correct that we should ensure that money

flows to small businesses and enterprises that truly need it. I look forward to working with him and our colleagues on reforms to the program should Congress make the decision to extend it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I send to the desk be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESSIONAL INTENT FOR H.R. 7010

We, the undersigned Members of Congress, would like to clarify the congressional intent for H.R. 7010, the Paycheck Protection Program Flexibility Act of 2020. The Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) was authorized by Congress under the CARES Act as a short-term solution to help businesses make ends meet and continue to pay their employees during the initial shocks of the COVID-19 pandemic. Under the CARES Act, authorized funds for the program are set to expire on June 30, 2020, allowing for no new loans to be issued after this date.

H.R. 7010 amends the CARES Act to provide businesses with greater flexibility for their use of PPP loans. Section 3(a) of H.R. 7010 changes the definition of the "covered period" defined by section 1102(a) of the CARES Act to be from February 15, 2020 to December 31, 2020 instead of from February 15, 2020 to June 30, 2020, as under current law. We wish to clarify the congressional intent of this extension of the covered period to December 31, 2020, and our expectations about how the amended program will operate.

The CARES Act requires that PPP loans may only be spent on allowable uses during the covered period. In addition to the uses otherwise allowed by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, the CARES Act authorizes as allowable uses "payroll costs; costs related to the continuation of group health care benefits during periods of paid sick, medical, or family leave, and insurance premiums; employee salaries, commissions, or similar compensations; payments of interest on any mortgage obligation (which shall not include any prepayment of or payment of principal on a mortgage obligation); rent (including rent under a lease agreement); utilities; and interest on any other debt obligations that were incurred before the covered period." The intention of the extension of the covered period in H.R. 7010 is to allow borrowers who received PPP loans before June 30, 2020 to continue to make expenditures for allowable uses until December 31, 2020. The extension of the covered period does not authorize the Small Business Administration (SBA) to issue any new PPP loans after June 30, 2020, as this date remains fixed by section 1102(b) of the CARES Act.

The extension of the covered period defined in section 1102(a) of the CARES Act should not be construed so as to permit the SBA to continue accepting applications for loans after June 30, 2020. Our intent and understanding of the law is that, consistent with the CARES Act as amended by H.R. 7010, when the authorization of funds to guarantee new PPP loans expires on June 30, 2020, the SBA and participating lenders will stop accepting and approving applications for PPP loans, regardless of whether the commitment level enacted by the Paycheck Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act has been reached.

MIKE LEE,
United States Senator.
MARCO RUBIO,

United States Senator.
DEAN PHILLIPS,
Member of Congress.
RON JOHNSON,
United States Senator.
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
United States Senator.
CHIP ROY,
Member of Congress.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

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

The bill (H.R. 7010) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motion with respect to the Pack nomination ripen at 11:40 a.m. tomorrow, with 20 minutes of debate under the control of Senator MENENDEZ prior to the vote; I further ask that if cloture is invoked on the Pack nomination, the postcloture time expire at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow; finally, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

TRIBUTE TO PIA CORONA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are so many critical jobs that go on around the Capitol that may not always get the spotlight or appreciation they deserve.

Today, I would like to mention one such amazing person, Pia Corona, or as she is affectionately known, Ms. Pia.

You see, Pia is a teacher at the Senate Employees Childcare Center, a caring, nurturing, and deeply special component of the Senate community.

Six years ago, on the 30th anniversary of the center, then-Senator Tom Harkin described the teachers and administrators at the center as, "some of the unsung heroes of the Senate."

I couldn't agree more, and it is a privilege to pay special tribute today to one of those unsung heroes.

This month marks Pia's 25 year anniversary teaching at the center, a mon-

umental accomplishment that has allowed her the opportunity to have a lasting impact on countless young lives.

A number of children of my staff were fortunate to have Ms. Pia as a teacher and cannot say enough wonderful things about her, so much so that they still keep in touch and bring their children by to visit years after leaving the center. Elle, Oliver and Leo, just three of many examples, still recognize Ms. Pia as an impactful figure in their early lives and in their education.

Pia, a stalwart New York Yankees fan, started at the Senate Employees Childcare Center in May 1995, always working in the pre-kindergarten class to help children prepare for the big jump to elementary school kindergarten. Over the last two and half decades, she taught more than 400 children, including many siblings.

Ms. Pia has a unique understanding of how each child learns differently and loving ability to meet those individual needs at such a tender and formative age. Not surprisingly, she is described by her colleagues as a walking encyclopedia of knowledge on child development, and her classroom lessons and caring style reflect these incredible talents.

One of her special field trips was a walk over to the late Senator John Glenn's office when her students were studying space. A picture of this outing still hangs at the center.

Pia also helped organize a visit to this very Senate floor for her class. They listened patiently as the Secretary of the Senate gave her own pre-K version of School House Rock. It was, without a doubt, the most well-behaved gathering that the Senate floor has seen in years.

Pia makes such an impression on children that many of her former students still reach out to her, including one recent college graduate who wanted to say thank you all these years later. I know children of some of my staff have returned to the center to read to Ms. Pia's students during storytime.

As we struggle with the coronavirus pandemic, we have all been reminded once again of the critical importance of our teachers and schools. Ms. Pia's students certainly knew that was the case from their time in her class.

We all remember a teacher or two who made a lasting impact on our lives growing up—challenging us, inspiring us, nurturing us. Ms. Pia will surely be one that many remember as just such a special teacher.

I congratulate Pia Corona on her notable anniversary and deeply meaningful contribution to the Senate community. Our country and our world need good news and kindness right now. Simply put, that is Ms. Pia.

CONGRESSIONAL POWER OF THE PURSE ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the authors of our Constitution purposefully built checks and balances into the foundation of our democracy, and the power of the purse is a critical part of those checks and balances. Article 1, section 9 of the Constitution states “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.” That means Congress, not the executive branch, is charged with making decisions about how to invest and spend Federal revenue. As the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I take this responsibility very seriously.

When Congress appropriates Federal dollars, we expect those dollars to be used as directed. We expect appropriations laws to be upheld, and we expect the administration to be transparent in its actions.

But for too many years, Presidents of both parties have encroached on the power of the purse as they have tried to expand their budgetary powers and, in some cases, substitute their judgment for that of Congress. This has been acutely true under this administration. No President has pushed the boundaries of and contorted appropriations law more than President Trump.

When Congress refused to give President Trump the money he requested for a wall on the southern border, he directed his administration to sidestep Congress and take it from funding for our military and their families. He continues to do so to this day.

The President wanted to pressure the Government of Ukraine into investigating his political rival, so he withheld security money for Ukraine in violation of the Impoundment Control Act. An action that would eventually lead to his impeachment.

Last year, the administration asserted to Congress that it had the power to propose rescissions in the last quarter of the fiscal year and further asserted it had the power to allow the funds to lapse if Congress did not act on its proposal, essentially claiming the executive branch, not Congress, had the last word on spending. The Government Accountability Office, GAO, thankfully and rightfully, disagreed. Last year, this administration also overturned a long held precedent that the executive branch did not need to respond to findings by GAO of violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act. Finally, this administration has suppressed OMB and executive branch agency cooperation with GAO in investigating the execution of appropriated funds.

The push and pull over the power of the purse between Congress and the executive branch did not start with President Trump and will not end when he is no longer in office. Administrations of both parties have clashed with Congress over this authority. But the actions of this President make clear that Congress needs to reassert itself

and defend its constitutionally granted prerogatives. This should not be a partisan issue. The Founders chose to vest the power of the purse with Congress. It is an important part of our system of checks and balances, and we must defend it.

That is why I am introducing the Congressional Power of the Purse Act. This bill will restore Congress’s central role in funding decisions, increase transparency in the executive branch, and add teeth to existing budget laws.

The bill strengthens the Impoundment Control Act, including the addition of penalties for failure to comply. The bill strengthens administration reporting requirements and congressional oversight tools, so Congress can better follow the money and ensure the law is being complied with. Finally, the bill reforms the National Emergencies Act of 1974 to provide more Congressional control over these designations and how they are used. I hope all members can support it.

I commend Representative LOWEY and Representative YARMUTH for introducing a similar bill in the House, and I hope that the House will send the bill to the Senate in July.

I ask unanimous consent that the following members be listed as original cosponsors: Senators MURRAY, VAN HOLLEN, FEINSTEIN, COONS, BALDWIN, WYDEN, MERKLEY, WHITEHOUSE, SCHATZ, SANDERS, SHAHEEN, TESTER, UDALL, CARDIN, REED, DURBIN, MURPHY and MANCHIN. I would note that this list of cosponsors includes every Democratic Member of the Appropriations Committee.

(At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I was absent when the Senate voted on vote No. 104 to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 655. Victor G. Mercado, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vote No. 105 to confirm Mr. Mercado, vote No. 106 to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 652, Brian D. Miller, of Virginia, to be Special Inspector General for Pandemic Recovery, and vote No. 107 to confirm Mr. Miller. On votes Nos. 104 and 105, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to invoke cloture and confirm Mr. Mercado. On votes Nos. 106 and 107, had I present, I would have voted no on the motion to invoke cloture and confirm Mr. Miller.

Mr. President, I was absent when the Senate voted on vote No. 108 to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 656, James H. Anderson, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. On vote No. 108, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to invoke cloture on Mr. Anderson.

Mr. President, I was absent when the Senate voted on vote No. 109 to confirm Executive Calendar No. 656, James H. Anderson, of Virginia, to be a Deputy

Under Secretary of Defense. On vote No. 109, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to confirm Mr. Anderson.

Mr. President, I was absent when the Senate voted on vote No. 110 to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 644, Drew B. Tipton, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas. On vote No. 110, had I been present, I would have voted no on the motion to invoke cloture on Mr. Tipton.

Mr. President, I was absent when the Senate voted on vote No. 111 to confirm Executive Calendar No. 644, Drew B. Tipton, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas. On vote No. 111, had I been present, I would have voted no on the motion to confirm Mr. Tipton.●

DEFENSE NOMINATIONS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, after Monday’s shameful display by the Secretary of Defense, I voted against the President’s nominees to be Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities.

The language of war has no place on American streets in the face of peaceful protests. Secretary Esper’s dangerous comment that the military needs to “dominate the battlespace”—referring to American cities—threatened the lives of American citizens exercising their constitutional rights. His willingness to accompany the President to a photo-op after gassing peaceful protesters underscores the moral rot in the Department’s leadership.

At this time, I have lost confidence that any nominee can be trusted to stand up to the President’s attempts to weaponize the Defense Department for his personal and political ends. For that reason, I voted against his nominees in the Department.

INTERNATIONAL DAY AGAINST HOMOPHOBIA, TRANSPHOBIA AND BIPHOBIA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to mark the start of LGBT Pride Month with reflections on the recent International Day against Homophobia, Transphobia and Biphobia—IDAHOBIT. For more than 50 years, Pride Month has been a reminder that, despite recent progress, every day, millions of people around the world face social stigmatization, legal prosecution, and even violence based on their sexual orientation or because of their gender identity. COVID-19 is necessitating adjustments to how this month is celebrated, with organizers moving large-scale parades from the streets of towns and cities to the internet, where a 24-hour online Global Pride celebration is planned for later this month.

Two short weeks ago was the annual commemoration of the International Day against Homophobia, Transphobia

and Biphobia—IDAHOBIT. Started on May 17, 2004, IDAHOBIT was established by LGBTQ activists in 2004 to commemorate the World Health Organization's historic decision in 1990 to remove homosexuality from the International Classification of Diseases. As in the United States, despite the progress we have made since 1990, around the world, homophobia, transphobia, and biphobia continue to flourish in many parts of the world.

The theme of this year's International Day against Homophobia, Transphobia and Biphobia was "Breaking the Silence." Millions of LGBTQ individuals around the world continue to be forced to hide their identities because of who they are or whom they love. They struggle to achieve the most basic of human rights, let alone respect and visibility. The International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association—ILGA—lists 70 countries in which same-sex activities are outlawed, and penalties range from 8 years' imprisonment to the death penalty. Even in countries that do not criminalize homosexuality, many still have laws on the books that make living openly next to impossible. Only five countries, of which the United States is not one, ban the damaging practice of conversion therapy.

This type of discrimination has only been compounded by the global outbreak of COVID-19. In addition to the widespread health and economic hardship that this pandemic is creating, it is producing new risks and forms of persecution for the LGBTQ community.

In Uganda, security forces stormed an LGBTQ shelter, binding the occupants' hands with rope before marching them to a nearby police station on charges of disobeying social distancing rules. In Latin America, transgender, nonbinary, and queer people who present as gender-nonconforming are being detained or fined for going to the grocery store on days designated by the government as "men-only" or "women-only." Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban has used the pandemic as an excuse to move legislation that will ban the legal recognition of transgender citizens. Meanwhile, in South Korea, there is a disturbing rise in online hate speech blaming the LGBTQ community for spreading the coronavirus. A number of religious leaders around the world have cruelly attributed the spread of COVID-19 to divine retribution for recognition of same-sex marriages.

The COVID-19 pandemic will eventually fade, but the abuse of LGBTQ people will continue unless we come together as a global community to put an end to it. Historically, the United States has been a strong international leader on issues of human rights like this one. However, the current administration's neglect of LGBTQ rights, both at home and abroad, has hurt our credibility and diminished our power to make positive change.

Within the United States, the Trump administration has issued rules sanctioning employment, housing, medical, and other forms of discrimination based on gender identity. It has also repeatedly used religious liberty as a shield to enable discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. On a global scale, the administration has attempted to undermine internationally recognized definitions of human rights through the U.S. State Department's Commission on Inalienable Rights and turned a blind eye to the persecution of LGBTQ people in other countries. It is said that you can measure the strength of a democracy by the rights it affords to marginalized communities, these actions do not reflect the strong democracy that we strive to be.

Looking at the state of the world today, it is clear that we need more champions for LGBTQ rights on the international stage. We need more leaders to break the silence and speak up for everyone's right to live truly as themselves. This Pride Month, I am hopeful that the United States will once again be one of those voices. For my part, I will keep fighting to protect LGBTQ rights at home and around the globe, so that all people can pursue happiness and love without fear.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ART STAVENS

• Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I want to honor the service and dedication of one of North Dakota's most dedicated volunteer firefighters.

Art Stavens of Hatton, ND, became a member of the Hatton Volunteer Fire Department in 1951 and has served ever since. Art turned 95 on May 19 and was honored by his fellow firefighters and community residents with a surprise drive-by parade past his home. It appropriately included several fire trucks.

His time in the department has included being the fire chief for 6 years and assistant fire chief for another 3 years. When Art stopped responding to fire calls, he could be found standing on the highway directing vehicles to the location of a fire.

Art still attends firefighter functions such as meetings and conventions, and he remains as dedicated as ever to the role of volunteers who step forward to protect their communities.

Art Stavens may be the longest serving volunteer firefighter in the United States. On behalf of all North Dakotans, I thank him for his 69 years of service on the Hatton Volunteer Fire Department. I congratulate him on his 95th birthday and wish him many more years of health and happiness. •

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with

accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4638. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Charles D. Luckey, United States Army Reserve, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4639. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Admiral James G. Foggo III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4640. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burundi that was declared in Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4641. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4642. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4643. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4644. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic that was declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4645. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4646. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Director, Shareholder, and Member Meetings" (RIN1557-AE94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4647. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility, Internal Docket ID FEMA-8629" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2020-0005)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4648. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community

Eligibility, Internal Docket ID FEMA-8627” ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2020-0005)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4649. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility, Internal Docket ID FEMA-8625” ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2020-0005)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4650. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Interim Final Rule - Regulatory Capital Rule: Transitions for the Community Bank Leverage Ratio Framework” (RIN3064-AF47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4651. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Interim Final Rule - Liquidity Coverage Ratio Rule: Treatment of Certain Emergency Facilities” (RIN3064-AF51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4652. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4653. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4654. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Nicaragua that was declared in Executive Order 13851 of November 27, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4655. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Interim Final Rule - Regulatory Capital Rule: Temporary Changes to the Community Bank Leverage Ratio Framework” (RIN3064-AF45) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4656. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Interim Final Rule - Real Estate Appraisals” (RIN3064-AF48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4657. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendments to the National Mar-

ket System Plan Governing the Consolidated Audit Trail” (RIN3235-AM60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4658. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Community Reinvestment Act Regulations” (RIN1557-AE34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4659. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendments to Financial Disclosures about Acquired and Disposed Businesses” (RIN3235-AL77) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4660. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementation of the Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act 2018” (RIN1615-AC28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4661. A communication from the Chief of Regulatory Analysis and Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Movement of Certain Genetically Engineered Organization” ((RIN0579-AE47) (Docket No. APHIS-2018-0034)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4662. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Ea peptide 91398; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 10007-57-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4663. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fenpyroximate; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 10009-14-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4664. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Washington; Northwest Clean Air Agency” (FRL No. 10009-59-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4665. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Provo, Utah Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan” (FRL No. 10009-49-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4666. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to extending and amending the agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4667. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s fiscal year 2019 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4668. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4669. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-06, Introduction” ((48 CFR Chapter 1) (FAC 2019-02)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4670. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2020-001, Revocation of Executive Order on Nondisplacement of Qualified Workers” (RIN9000-AO03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4671. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2018-007, Applicability of Inflation Adjustments of Acquisition-Related Thresholds” (RIN9000-AN67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4672. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-06, Technical Amendments” (FAC 2020-06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4673. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2016-013, Tax on Certain Foreign Procurement” (RIN9000-AN38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4674. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-06, Small Entity Compliance Guide” (FAC 2020-06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4675. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Temporary Changes to Requirements Affecting H-2A Nonimmigrants due to the COVID-19 National Emergency” (RIN1615-AC55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4676. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Temporary Changes to Requirements Affecting H-2B Nonimmigrants due to the COVID-19 National Emergency” (RIN1615-AC58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4677. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Definition for Permitting” (FRL No. 10009-10-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4678. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Redesignation of the Lemont and Pekin Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Areas” (FRL No. 10009-08-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4679. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Oklahoma; Updates to the General SIP and New Source Review Permitting Requirements; Correction” (FRL No. 10009-05-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4680. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Acequinocyl; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 10007-38-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4681. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Iowa; State Implementation Plan and Operating Permits Program” (FRL No. 10009-33-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4682. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Louisiana; Withdrawal of Stage II Vapor Recovery Systems Requirements” (FRL No. 10008-75-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4683. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled “Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2015 Ozone Standard; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule” (FRL No. 10009-41-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4684. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Clean Air Plans; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; Phoenix-Mesa, Arizona” (FRL No. 10009-19-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4685. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Louisiana; Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions and Incorporation by Reference” (FRL No. 10008-89-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4686. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Integrated Iron and Steel Manufacturing Facilities Residual Risk and Technology Review” (FRL No. 10008-45-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4687. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Control of Emissions from Aerospace Manufacture and Rework Facilities” (FRL No. 10007-12-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4688. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Oklahoma; Infrastructure for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (FRL No. 10006-43-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4689. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Tennessee; Chattanooga NSR Reform” (FRL No. 10007-17-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4690. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Texas; Dallas-Fort Worth Area Redesignation and Maintenance Plan for Revoked Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (FRL No. 10006-97-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4691. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled “Air Plan Approval; Tennessee; Chattanooga Miscellaneous Revisions” (FRL No. 10007-15-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4692. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Tennessee; Volatile Organic Compounds Definition Rule Revision for Chattanooga” (FRL No. 10006-95-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4693. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Quality Plans; Florida; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard” (FRL No. 10007-04-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4694. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County Administrative Revisions to Definitions, Remedies, and Enforcement Orders Sections and Incorporation by Reference of National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (FRL No. 10005-16-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4695. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; New Mexico and Albuquerque-Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Control of Emissions from Existing Other Solid Waste Incineration Units” (FRL No. 10006-30-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4696. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of State Plan (Negative Declaration) for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Vermont” (FRL No. 10006-58-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4697. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (19-1.B)” (FRL No. 10005-30-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 148. A resolution supporting efforts by the Government of Colombia to pursue peace and regional stability.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 192. An act to establish an inter-agency program to assist countries in North and West Africa to improve immediate and long-term capabilities to counter terrorist threats, and for other purposes.

S. 238. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to monitor and combat anti-Semitism globally, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 392. A resolution recognizing the importance of the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative to the relationship between the United States and the member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and to advancing the policy of the United States in the Indo-Pacific region.

S. Res. 406. A resolution recognizing that for 50 years, the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and its ten members, Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam, have worked with the United States toward stability, prosperity, and peace in Southeast Asia, and expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States will continue to remain a strong, reliable, and active partner in the ASEAN region.

S. Res. 454. A resolution calling for the immediate release of Cuban democracy activist Jose Daniel Ferrer and commending the efforts of Jose Daniel Ferrer to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms in Cuba.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 502. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 511. A resolution supporting the role of the United States in helping save the lives of children and protecting the health of people in developing countries with vaccines and immunization through GAVI, the Vaccine Alliance.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 523. A resolution recognizing the 199th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 525. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should continue to support the people of Nicaragua in their peaceful efforts to promote the restoration of democracy and the defense of human rights, and use the tools under United States law to increase political and economic pressure on the government of Daniel Ortega.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 533. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

S. Res. 542. A resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Dachau concentration camp during World War II.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 567. A resolution commending career professionals at the Department of State for their extensive efforts to repatriate United States citizens and legal permanent residents during the COVID-19 pandemic.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 712. A bill to provide assistance for United States citizens and nationals taken hostage or unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3176. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

* Sethuraman Panchanathan, of Arizona, to be Director of the National Science Foundation for a term of six years.

* Julie Elizabeth Hocker, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

* Richard Giacalone, of Virginia, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

* Marvin Kaplan, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2025.

* Andrea R. Lucas, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2025.

* Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2024.

* Jocelyn Samuels, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2021.

* Keith E. Sonderling, of Florida, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2024.

* Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 3869. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the expansion of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, to expand the Cyber Institutes Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 3870. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to recommend a minimum number

of bomber aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 3871. A bill to facilitate the performance of funeral honors details for veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 3872. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a time-limited provisional approval pathway, subject to specific obligations, for certain drugs and biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 3873. A bill to require law enforcement agencies to report the use of lethal force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. JONES):

S. 3874. A bill making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide bonus depreciation for certain space launch expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina:

S. 3876. A bill to make a technical correction relating to the treatment of refunds of merchandise processing fees under the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 3877. A bill to establish or expand programs to improve health equity regarding COVID-19 and reduce or eliminate inequities in the prevalence and health outcomes of COVID-19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 3878. A bill to protect employees from discrimination based on family caregiver responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 3879. A bill to preserve the constitutional authority of Congress and ensure accountability and transparency in legislation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COONS, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3880. A bill to establish the Office of International Disability Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 3881. A bill to increase support for State Children's Health Insurance programs during the COVID-19 emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 3882. A bill to establish the National Technology Industrial Base Quadrilateral Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the earned income tax credit available to residents of possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 3884. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to support the efforts of State and local governments to provide for priority testing of certain transportation workers with respect to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) and require the owners and operators of equipment and facilities used by passenger or freight transportation employers to clean, disinfect, and sanitize that equipment and provide personal protective equipment to certain employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3885. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to notify Congress regularly of reported cases of burn pit exposure by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. HIRONO)):

S. 3886. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for an explosive nuclear weapons test; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 3887. A bill to defer action regarding certain debts arising from benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a period of time including the COVID-19 emergency period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 3888. A bill to ensure that veterans receive timely and effective health care under the Veterans Community Care Program and Veterans Care Agreements during the COVID-19 emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 604. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Senate should not vote on the nomination of Michael Pack to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media unless and until Michael Pack corrects his false statements to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. Res. 605. A resolution providing for sufficient time for legislation to be read; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. WARREN,

Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 606. A resolution designating May 5, 2020, as the "National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 525

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 815

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 892, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax-exempt financing of certain government-owned buildings.

S. 948

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 948, a bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1200

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1200, a bill to create protections for depository institutions that

provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1652

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1652, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 1919

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1919, a bill to require certain grantees under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to submit a plan to track discriminatory land use policies, and for other purposes.

S. 1938

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1938, a bill to provide for grants for States that require fair and impartial police training for law enforcement officers of that State and to incentivize States to enact laws requiring the independent investigation and prosecution of the use of deadly force by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 2161

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2161, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for reciprocal marketing approval of certain drugs, biological products, and devices that are authorized to be lawfully marketed abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 2163

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2163, a bill to establish the Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys, to study and make recommendations to address social problems affecting Black men and boys, and for other purposes.

S. 2327

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added

as cosponsors of S. 2327, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the eligibility requirements for transfer of unused entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to provide for the restoration of legal rights for claimants under holocaust-era insurance policies.

S. 2733

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2733, a bill to save and strengthen critical social contract programs of the Federal Government.

S. 3003

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3003, a bill to provide requirements for the appropriate Federal banking agencies when requesting or ordering a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, to provide for additional requirements related to subpoenas issued under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, and for other purposes.

S. 3103

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3103, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore State authority to waive for certain facilities the 35-mile rule for designating critical access hospitals under the Medicare program.

S. 3221

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3221, a bill to place a moratorium on large concentrated animal feeding operations, to strengthen the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to require country of origin labeling on beef, pork, and dairy products, and for other purposes.

S. 3485

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3485, a bill to expand the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to expand revenue sharing for offshore wind, to reauthorize the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3597

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3597, a bill to appropriate funds for the SPR Petroleum Account.

S. 3611

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3611, a bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to reduce certain royalties, to amend the CARES Act to limit the provision of assistance to certain businesses, to impose a moratorium on certain oil and natural gas lease sales, the issuance of coal leases, and modifications to certain regulations, to extend certain public comment periods, and for other purposes.

S. 3612

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3612, a bill to clarify for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that receipt of coronavirus assistance does not affect the tax treatment of ordinary business expenses.

S. 3659

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3659, a bill to provide State and local workforce and career and technical education systems the support to respond to the COVID-19 national emergency.

S. 3660

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3660, a bill to provide emergency funding for caseworkers and child protective services.

S. 3703

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3703, a bill to amend the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act to improve the prevention of elder abuse and exploitation of individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 3750

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3750, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the accelerated and advance payment programs under parts A and B of the Medicare program during the COVID-19 emergency.

S. 3753

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3753, a bill to direct the

Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs have physical locations for the disposal of controlled substances medications.

S. 3755

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3755, a bill to provide for the establishment of a COVID-19 Compensation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 3756

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3756, a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a renewable fuel feedstock reimbursement program.

S. 3763

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3763, a bill to establish the Pandemic Responder Service Award program to express our gratitude to front-line health care workers.

S. 3861

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3861, a bill to establish privacy requirements for operators of infectious disease exposure notification services.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 604—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE SENATE SHOULD NOT VOTE ON THE NOMINATION OF MICHAEL PACK TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA UNLESS AND UNTIL MICHAEL PACK CORRECTS HIS FALSE STATEMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE SENATE AND THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 604

Whereas the Constitution of the United States requires, and the people of the United States expect and deserve, that the Senate provide advice and consent only to those executive branch nominees who are fit to hold positions of public trust in the United States Government;

Whereas Michael Pack is the nominee to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, which is

comprised of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio and TV Marti, Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Network;

Whereas Michael Pack created and controls both Public Media Lab, a nonprofit company, and Manifold Productions LLC, a for-profit company which he owns;

Whereas, since the creation of Public Media Lab, Michael Pack transferred 100 percent of the tax-exempt grants that Public Media Lab received to his for-profit company, Manifold Productions;

Whereas, for several years, in documentation submitted to the Internal Revenue Service that asked whether Public Media Lab had provided grants to any entity controlled by an officer of the nonprofit, Michael Pack responded “no” when the true answer was “yes”;

Whereas, for several years, in documentation submitted to the Internal Revenue Service that asked whether Public Media Lab conducted business with any entity with which it shared officers or directors, Michael Pack responded “no” when the true answer was “yes”;

Whereas, in 2019, when the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate raised the subject of the false statements that Michael Pack had made to the Internal Revenue Service, Mr. Pack claimed, in response to a question for the record, that the false statements were “an oversight”;

Whereas Michael Pack has refused to correct the false statements that he made to the Internal Revenue Service; and

Whereas, in early 2020, Michael Pack provided false information to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate with regard to his taxes; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) should provide advice and consent to executive branch nominees only if those nominees have been truthful in their dealings with Congress and the executive branch;

(2) should not vote on any nominee who has made verifiably false statements to Congress or the executive branch and who refuses to correct those statements; and

(3) should not vote on the nomination of Michael Pack to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media unless and until Michael Pack corrects his false statements to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Internal Revenue Service.

SENATE RESOLUTION 605—PROVIDING FOR SUFFICIENT TIME FOR LEGISLATION TO BE READ

Mr. PAUL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 605

Resolved,

SECTION 1. TIME FOR READING OF LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order for the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, message, conference report, amendment between the Houses, amendment, treaty, or other measure or matter until 1 session day has passed since introduction for every 20 pages included in the measure or matter in the usual form plus 1 session day for any number of remaining pages less than 20 in the usual form.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any Senator may raise a point of order that consideration of any bill, resolution, message, conference report, amendment, treaty, or other measure or matter is not in order under subsection (a). A motion to table the point of order shall not be in order.

(2) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. All motions to waive under this paragraph shall be debatable collectively for not to exceed 3 hours equally divided between the Senator raising the point of order and the Senator moving to waive the point of order or their designees. A motion to waive the point of order shall not be amendable.

(c) CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.—This resolution is adopted pursuant to the power granted to each House of Congress to determine the Rules of its Proceedings in article I, section 5, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 606—DESIGNATING MAY 5, 2020, AS THE “NATIONAL DAY OF AWARENESS FOR MISSING AND MURDERED NATIVE WOMEN AND GIRLS”

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 606

Whereas, according to a study commissioned by the Department of Justice, in some Tribal communities, American Indian women face murder rates that are more than 10 times the national average murder rate;

Whereas, according to the most recently available data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in 2017, homicide was the sixth leading cause of death for American Indian and Alaska Native females between 1 and 44 years of age;

Whereas little data exist on the number of missing American Indian and Alaska Native women in the United States;

Whereas, on July 5, 2013, Hanna Harris, a member of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, was reported missing by her family in Lane Deer, Montana;

Whereas the body of Hanna Harris was found 5 days after she went missing;

Whereas Hanna Harris was determined to have been raped and murdered, and the individuals accused of committing those crimes were convicted;

Whereas the case of Hanna Harris is an example of many similar cases; and

Whereas Hanna Harris was born on May 5, 1992; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 5, 2020, as the “National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls”; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups—

(A) to commemorate the lives of missing and murdered American Indian and Alaska Native women whose cases are documented and undocumented in public records and the media; and

(B) to demonstrate solidarity with the families of victims in light of those tragedies.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator RON WYDEN, intend to object to proceeding to S. 482, a bill to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to combat international cybercrime, and to impose additional sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, and for other purposes,

dated June 3, 2020 for the reasons as stated in the RECORD.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to give notice of my intent to object to any unanimous consent agreement regarding S. 482, the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act.

I want to first start by making myself clear: I support the vast majority of the provisions in this bill. It has now been over three years since Russia meddled in our last presidential election, and Congress has yet to hold Vladimir Putin accountable for it. I commend the bill’s sponsors for coming together, on a bipartisan basis, with legislation that would take real steps to address Moscow’s aggression.

Unfortunately, the bill is burdened by one extremely problematic, unrelated section, Title IV, or what was previously known as the International Cybercrime Prevention Act. This is now the fourth time my colleagues have attempted to jam that bill through this very chamber. In fact, the same exact language was first floated in 2015, only to be defeated. It was brought up again in 2016, and was, again, defeated. Once more, in 2018, this bill was introduced as a standalone bill and, again, defeated.

The authors of this problematic legislation are giving it one more try, this time by attempting to bury it within a largely unrelated 100-page, bipartisan legislative vehicle. And, by adding this language onto an extraneous foreign relations bill, my colleagues have been able to bypass the jurisdictional scrutiny of the Senate Judiciary Committee altogether.

Title IV of the bill is, at best, an extremely misguided piece of legislation. While its proponents claim the language is meant to fight botnets and other malicious cybercrime in a limited context, its effects would be far more broad-reaching. What this bill would do, in reality, is significantly expand the badly outdated Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, or the CFAA—a law that the Department of Justice (DOJ) has time and time again abused against cybersecurity researchers and activists, including the late Aaron Swartz.

Mr. President, advocates and legal experts have long warned that the CFAA chills legitimate speech and research. DOJ has adopted an interpretation of the CFAA so extreme that it has argued in federal court that it is illegal merely for someone to violate a website’s terms of service, such as by lying about their height, weight, or age in an online dating profile. While I take a back seat to no one when it comes to protecting Americans from hackers and improving our nation’s cybersecurity, DOJ has stretched this Reagan-era hacking law to absurdity.

The last time the International Cybercrime Prevention Act was proposed in this chamber, I voted against it because I believed then, as I do now, that the draconian CFAA must be modernized. I have sought to reform the

CFAA, and rather than addressing its many serious flaws, Title IV of DASKA expands it, creating broad new prohibitions and harsh penalties.

Mr. President, I've said it before and I'll say it again. The bill before us is a resoundingly good bill—but it is one that is held back by one small and unrelated section. My hope is that, working in a bipartisan way, we can resolve this glaring problem with DASKA. However, until that happens, I will object to any unanimous consent request to proceed to the legislation.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 2020, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Donald L. Moak and William Zollars to be Governors, U.S. Postal Service, and Hon. Mark A. Robbins, Carl E. Ross, and Elizabeth J. Shapiro to be Associate

Judges, Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 2020, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

NATIONAL DAY OF AWARENESS FOR MISSING AND MURDERED NATIVE WOMEN AND GIRLS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 606, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 606) designating May 5, 2020, as the "National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls".

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

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 606) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pre-

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

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

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 2020

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, June 4; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Pack nomination, under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:08 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 4, 2020, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 03, 2020:

THE JUDICIARY

DREW B. TIPTON, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JAMES H. ANDERSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.