



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2020

No. 155

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, September 11, 2020, at 1 p.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2020

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Faithful Father, our refuge and strength, give us such lawmakers that their lives will enable You to be glorified by bringing healing to our land. Lord, provide our Nation with physical, mental, social, and spiritual healing by the power of Your grace. Sustained by this grace, may our Senators seek to please You in all they do. Inspire them to give You cheerfully their highest allegiance.

Be gracious, mighty God, to our Nation and world. Empower us all until the words of our mouths and the meditation of our hearts are acceptable to You.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

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

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

IOWA FARMERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, this year has been one of the most challenging years for Iowa farmers during my 40 years in the Senate. Farmers have had to confront coronavirus supply chain disruptions, widespread drought, and a record windstorm that moved across our State.

During my 99 county meetings, I saw Iowa fields that were completely destroyed—150 miles long and 40 miles wide. The images of mature crops lying flat on the ground were heartbreaking. Iowans are a very resilient people, but the hurt the farmers have endured this year will be felt in our State for a few years to come.

Senator ERNST and I will keep fighting to strengthen Iowa's farm economy despite this year's very challenging situations.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, anyone watching the Senate yesterday saw another installment in an ongoing series that has become somewhat familiar. Republicans roll out yet another effort to forge a bipartisan compromise around coronavirus relief, and Democrats reply with partisan cheap shots and threats to block everything.

Republicans develop a serious plan to get historic amounts of additional

money in the pipeline for kids, jobs, and schools, and Democrats just point fingers, call names, and keep blocking American families from getting any more help before the November election.

In July, Republicans put forward a serious framework, but Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leader refused to talk unless the starting point was their literally absurd \$3.4 trillion far-left wish list that even House Democrats called a stunt.

In August, with those talks stalled, Republicans proposed narrow agreements on specific urgent policies to help families, unemployment benefits, the Paycheck Protection Program. Democrats refused again. This time their invented excuse was that any assistance short of their entire wish list was too "piecemeal"—too "piecemeal"—and not worth doing.

If Democrats didn't get their diversity studies for the cannabis industry, stimulus checks for illegal immigrants, and tax cuts for blue State millionaires, they would make sure millions of Americans would lose their unemployment benefits and PPP would close. That is what they threatened, and that is what they did.

So here we are in September. Schools and colleges have gone without the \$105 billion that Republicans wanted to give them back in July. That is more money than Speaker PELOSI put in her bill.

American workers have gone without the second round of the PPP that Republicans proposed weeks and weeks ago. Speaker PELOSI had no money for PPP in her \$3.4 trillion bill.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5479

The race for treatments and vaccines has gone without the additional funding that Republicans wanted to deliver. Families have gone without the economic relief that Republicans wanted to put in their pockets. And Washington Democrats have just kept trying to run out the clock—run out the clock—until November.

But here is one thing: The Senate majority works for the American people. We fight for American families. We are not going to let Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leader kill and bury coronavirus relief behind closed doors without putting every Senator on the record. So we have put together a new, targeted proposal containing several of the most urgent and most popular policies that would help Americans right now. Tomorrow, the whole Senate will vote on it.

It will be a procedural vote. It is not a vote to pass our bill tomorrow, precisely as written. It is a vote for Senators to say whether they want to move forward toward huge amounts of relief for kids, for jobs, for healthcare, or whether they are happier doing absolutely nothing.

That is what every single Senator will decide tomorrow. Do you want to do something—something—or do you want to do nothing?

Democratic leaders know this simple choice will put the spotlight on their partisan antics. They know this vote will expose their obstruction.

Speaker PELOSI and Leader SCHUMER were attacking our new proposal yesterday before they even read it, before it had even come out. I would normally make fun of that, but in this case it makes perfect sense because their position clearly is that they do not want any bipartisan relief whatsoever. They do not want any bipartisan relief whatsoever to reach American families prior to the election.

They didn't even need to see what we were proposing. If it helped working families in any way—in any way—between now and November 3, Speaker PELOSI and Leader SCHUMER knew for sure they opposed it.

Their red herrings and cherry-picked arguments have now given way to total dishonesty. Yesterday, our colleague from New York railed against a provision pertaining to critical supply chains, calling it some sinister giveaway to big business. A provision pertaining to critical supply chains he called a sinister giveaway to big business? That provision is cosponsored by his own Democratic ranking member on the committee. So either the Democratic leader is impugning his own ranking member right along with Republicans or else he simply doesn't know what he is talking about.

Likewise, the junior Senator from Vermont attacked this provision as “corporate welfare,” but he himself did not vote against this very provision in committee on two occasions.

They are so desperate to keep working families from getting any help be-

fore the election that some Democrats are now attacking things they previously supported. At this point it is just silly season on the Democratic side. They have run out of excuses not to legislate, and even their cheap shots just backfire in embarrassing ways.

So tomorrow—tomorrow—the Senate will cut through all the noise with one vote. Every Senator will either say they want to move forward, agree where we can, make a law to help people, and keep arguing over our differences later or say they prefer to do absolutely nothing.

Every Senator will vote on this significant package, which secures Federal unemployment benefits, reopens the PPP for a second draw, sends more than \$100 billion to keep kids safe in school, helps parents with childcare, helps families afford expenses or homeschooling, and rebuilds our strategic medical stockpile.

This is not a simplistic argument over big versus small. Republicans want more money for K-12 and college than was in the Democratic bill. We want more money for PPP, which their bill forgot to fund. These are bipartisan priorities that Democrats left behind and Republicans want to take care of.

So tomorrow—tomorrow—American families will learn who wants to make a law for them and who is happiest if they get nothing.

146TH KENTUCKY DERBY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a completely different matter, on Saturday, the world of sports once again revolved around my hometown of Louisville for the 146th Kentucky Derby. Like so many other events, the coronavirus made this year's derby look a little different.

The race had already been postponed for only the second time in history, and none of the 150,000 spectators who normally fill Churchill Downs were there to sing “My Old Kentucky Home,” but the most exciting 2 minutes in sports refused to be defeated.

The derby remains the longest continuously held sporting event, and this year's Labor Day derby proved worth the wait. The winning thoroughbred, Authentic, outlasted a ferocious challenge from the favorite. So I would like to extend the Senate's congratulations to the entire Hall of Fame team.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 4547 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Brett H. Ludwig, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the amount of 1984-like doublespeak that comes out of the other side never ceases to amaze, and I guess it is becoming more and more extreme. The Republican leader calls his bill bipartisan? I would remind the leader that “bipartisan” means two parties, Democrats and Republicans. His bill is only a product of the Republican side.

The Republican leader said Democrats are delaying things. Was it Democrats who called for a pause? Was it Democrats who, when COVID was raging, said we had to assess the situation? Oh, no, it was the Republican leader who said those things. Meanwhile, Democrats in the House, supported by Democrats in the Senate, have passed a strong comprehensive bill. We have just been waiting and waiting for our Republican friends to get their act together so they might come close—even near to the moment that we need.

So, after taking a pause on COVID relief for 4 months, finally, finally, finally, Senate Republicans are realizing the damage that their delay has done to our economy and the Nation's health.

Yesterday, Leader MCCONNELL announced that by the end of the week, the Senate would vote on a new slimmed-down version of an already skinny Republican bill. We know what happened here. The leader did nothing for months, but the American people are demanding action. Republican Governors, local officials, hospitals, small businesses—everyone is demanding action. Restaurants, performance stages, and places are demanding action not just of Democrats but of both sides of the aisle.

So the leader had to do something. At first, he tried to cobble together a legislative response, but it failed spectacularly. Leader MCCONNELL was unable to bring it even forward for a vote.

That happened a couple of weeks ago. So, now, because he can't get the votes because, by his own admission, 20 of his own members want no money voted in this crisis—how many Americans think there should be no money at the height of the greatest economic crisis we have had since the Depression, the height of the greatest health crisis we have had since the Spanish pandemic flu? How many Americans think the Federal Government should do nothing? But a large chunk of the Republican caucus evidently seems to, by the Republican leader's own admission.

So he couldn't even get this \$1 trillion bill passed. It was pathetic. So, now, Republicans are going to cut their original inadequate \$1 trillion bill in half in a desperate attempt to find the lowest common denominator among Republicans.

As the economic pain for millions of Americans advances, Senate Republicans are actually moving backward. Of course, up until now, the issue in our negotiations with the White House, where Leader MCCONNELL had been absent, has been about the size and scope of the next relief bill. Democrats passed a \$3 trillion bill in the House over 2 months ago. Why? That is the need of America during this great crisis. We didn't come up with just any numbers. We studied it carefully. We talked to school administrators and asked: What do you need? We talked to hospital administrators and asked: What do you need? We talked to restaurants, and we talked to performance places and asked: What do you need? And we came up with a carefully thought-out bill that met the need.

Our Republican friends didn't meet the need. They came out with what they call a skinny bill at \$1 trillion. We all know why the rightwing ideology that has so gripped so much of the Republican Party doesn't want to spend any money. We, at least, in an offer to compromise, offered to meet our Republican friends in the middle. They balked. No, no, they didn't want to compromise. Their way or no way. And now, instead of improving their offer, Senate Republicans have made it even stingier and even less appropriate for the looming crisis that we have.

I am not sure what kind of negotiating strategy that is, but it sure isn't a serious strategy, and it sure will not be successful. That is why I called it cynical yesterday.

COVID-19 has changed nearly every aspect of American life. The needs in our country are so great. The pain felt by average Americans is severe. Yet the new Republican proposal doesn't include food assistance for people who can't feed their kids, rental assistance for people being kicked out of their homes, or aid to State and local governments desperate not to lay off bus-drivers and sanitation workers and firefighters.

In their new bill, Republicans will not even let the States use existing funds to cover lost revenues. It leaves

out important worker protections. It leaves out hazard pay. It leaves out broadband so desperately needed in rural areas. It leaves out funding for safe elections and help for the census. It shortchanges our healthcare system and education system.

As the school year begins across the country, the new "emaciated" Republican bill basically makes funding for schools contingent upon reopening. So if you are a school that is struggling with the costs of operating remotely, if you are a school that would like to reopen safely but needs help instituting new standards and protections, the GOP bill says "tough luck." Donald Trump comes up with this idea that all schools must reopen, and our Republican colleagues, in obeisance, come up with a proposal that says to the millions of kids who will go to school remotely or in hybrid situations: We are going to make it much harder for you to get help.

That is to say nothing about the fact that the new Republican COVID bill is laden with poison pills designed to make its passage impossible. Someone looking at this would say: If they want to come to a compromise, why would they put poison pills in the bill that they know are nonstarters to getting bipartisan compromise? Is it because they really don't want a bill but a political issue—one that would ultimately backfire on them, I believe. But they have done it.

There is broad corporate immunity that my colleague in Illinois has so focused on—an immunity provision that would protect corporations that put their workers in harm's way from legal liability. And evidently to get a handful of hard-right Senators who didn't want to spend any money, they added a partisan school choice program long sought by Secretary DeVos—hardly a friend of public education.

Republicans call their new bill "targeted," but by almost every measure, it misses the mark. It is impossible to look at the new GOP proposal as a serious effort to passing a law. It is impossible to look at this GOP proposal and not wonder: Do our Republican friends see the damage in America? Are they still intent on playing these same games? Are they still trying to fool the American people by calling the harshly partisan proposal bipartisan, as the leader just did?

If Republicans were serious about achieving a result, they would have joined negotiations with Speaker PELOSI, me, and the White House. If Leader MCCONNELL was so eager to get something done, why wasn't he at the table for weeks? Republicans could have encouraged the White House to improve their offer, to meet us in the middle, to break the logjam. Where were the Republican Senators? I haven't heard a voice speak out and say we should meet in the middle. They are all so afraid of what Donald Trump might say, I suppose.

Leader MCCONNELL, instead, crafted a partisan bill—with no input from

Democrats—even leaner and meaner than the previous Republican proposal and would rush it to the floor 2 days after releasing it. This is one of the most cynical moves by any leader I have ever seen. This isn't about making law or working in good faith with the other party. Leader MCCONNELL isn't searching for bipartisan progress. He seems to be looking for political cover. It will not pass on Thursday, and we will be right back where we are today, needing our Republican colleagues to understand the gravity of this situation in our country and to work with us on a bill that actually makes some sense and deals with the magnitude of this awful crisis.

SAVE OUR STAGES ACT

Madam President, now a final matter. The new Republican bill is silent on a whole host of crucial issues, including a number of items that affect small businesses.

Over the State work period, I visited several independent music and theater venues that have struggled during the COVID-19 pandemic. Live venues were some of the first to close, and they will be the last to open up. Many of them are already on the brink of collapse. There is the rent, the utilities, and an entire year without revenue.

Live venues—by definition, people are close together, so they couldn't continue during COVID, and they have to wait until the very end. But they are so important to so many communities—urban, suburban, and rural.

Unfortunately, according to one survey, 90 percent of independent venues will have to close permanently without Federal funding. What an incredible shame that would be. These are indie music venues, jazz clubs, symphony orchestra halls, comedy clubs, and even Broadway, which is made up of dozens of small theaters that employ thousands of workers, from the box office to the backstage. These independent venues provide 75 percent of all artists' income, and they drive economic activity within our communities at restaurants, hotels, stores, and other establishments.

But what we risk if these venues close permanently isn't purely economic, although it is so important. I was in Albany and Syracuse yesterday. It is estimated that the arts are one of the top five employers in both of those cities. We can't afford to let this happen. Economically, we will lose thousands and thousands of jobs. Cities will lose city downtowns, and rural areas, as well, will lose their vitality.

The risk, if these venues close permanently, is not just economic. They are the very fabric of our society, which has been stretched to the breaking point by this crisis. Once this is all over, we will need these venues and the passionate, inspiring, artistic work that they help make possible as we come together again and try to make sense of this incredibly difficult moment in our history.

We have a bipartisan bill—Save Our Stages Act—that would create a new

\$10-billion SBA program to provide Federal grants to live-venue operators so that when, God willing, these live stages can reopen safely, these venues can come back bigger and better than ever. Those grants would go for 6 months, giving the venues enough time and breathing room to recuperate, and, God willing, if there is a vaccine in 6 months, they will be able, God willing, to open again.

One of the most difficult parts of this pandemic has been the effect on American society, arts, and culture. These are the things we live for: sports, comedy, theater, and music. When the day finally comes that the pandemic is behind us, we will want to celebrate once again with friends and family at these venues now in danger of closing.

I hope we can come together in the future to pass the Save Our Stages Act and save this essential part of American culture.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague from New York. Many of the things he has said on the floor this morning reflect what I have seen back in Illinois in the last 5 or 6 weeks that we have been home, people I have spoken to who are genuinely suffering because of the coronavirus pandemic and the state of the American economy.

There was a moment here on the floor of the Senate earlier this year when the gravity of the situation brought us together. It was March 26—almost 6 months ago—when we voted 96 to 0 to pass the CARES Act, the \$3 trillion effort to try to keep America's economy alive and breathing during this pandemic and the impact it has had on all of our lives. That is \$3 trillion—money for the unemployed, substantial sums for those who are about to see their lives transformed overnight. Laid off and fired from jobs that may never return, they tried to keep their families together with mortgage payments, rent payments, automobile loans, the credit responsibilities they faced, and just putting food on the table.

It was a wrenching, disquieting situation for so many of those families, and we said that we should give them \$600 a week—\$600 a week—in Federal assistance to get through this period. What we did not only helped those families, but it helped the economy. The money those families received was spent almost instantaneously. That is understandable. They are struggling to survive.

But we knew that the program we enacted on March 26 had a termination date of July 31. We hoped that by then the pandemic would be behind us, our economy would be recovering, and we wouldn't need any further relief. We were wrong—terribly wrong. We still face this coronavirus in a way that we never expected 6 months ago. It is still

a challenge—a terrible challenge that has claimed over 180,000 American lives to date.

I could speak for a few minutes here about our response as a nation to this pandemic and talk about the lack of leadership from the very top in Washington when it came to dealing with this public health crisis, but suffice it to say for the moment that two numbers tell the story. The United States has 4 percent of the world's population. Sadly, we have 20 percent of the COVID-19 deaths in the world.

The United States has not responded as expected. Innocent people have died. The situation was chaotic in the White House. The leadership we needed wasn't there.

Where are we today? Here we are in the second week of September. Where are we now as we reflect on the situation? Many of us believe we still face a grievous, serious challenge and need to respond accordingly, but others see it differently.

Senator MCCONNELL, the leader on the Republican side, is going to offer a proposal tomorrow that is a fraction—a fraction—of what was offered on March 26 to deal with this crisis. Many people, obviously on the Republican side, feel that America is headed in the right direction and therefore we don't need to make a substantial investment in people, in businesses, and in the health and resources of this country.

For those who come to the floor and argue that America is headed in the right direction, three-fourths of the American people disagree with them. You see, in a survey taken just 2 weeks ago, 75 percent of the American people said America is headed in the wrong direction. So when the Republicans come up with a modest—almost immodest—proposal that they are going to bring to the floor tomorrow, they disagree with three-fourths of the American people.

Many of them obviously believe that we don't have to make a massive investment in helping families who are fighting unemployment, helping businesses to survive. They must believe that the worst is behind us. Well, it turns out that two out of three of the American people disagree with them. That is right—two out of three in a recent survey in America said the worst is still ahead. Wrong direction, 75 percent; the worst is still ahead, two-thirds.

What is the response on the Republican side? First, it was silence. You see, it has been almost 4 months now since the House of Representatives, under the Democratic leadership of Speaker PELOSI, passed the Heroes Act—a \$3 trillion investment to make sure that we stood by the families who were unemployed, to make sure that we put money into the hands of businesses that needed to survive, to make certain that we had adequate testing across the United States, to give money to schools so that they could weather this crisis as they readjust to

the challenges they face, and to put money in the hands of hospitals and providers that in some cases are just hanging by a thread because of the state of the economy and this medical challenge. That is what Speaker PELOSI did almost 4 months ago.

In the meantime, in that 4-month period, the Republican leader of the Senate has done nothing—nothing. He didn't bring a bill to the floor. He didn't pass a bill and call for a conference committee. In fact, during this entire period of time, the Republican leader in the Senate has refused to personally attend the negotiations between the White House and congressional leaders. Both he and House Republican Leader MCCARTHY have boycotted any negotiation sessions. Any persuasion they want to bring to the issue, they bring to the floor of the Senate in speeches, not behind closed doors, where compromise is reached and where, in fact, we were successful last March, passing the CARES Act.

So now we face a challenge as a nation. Which party will stand up for America to weather this crisis and come out strong? The Democrats have a proposal. We have had it for 4 months.

The Republicans, tomorrow, will offer a skinny—some say emaciated—version of that proposal. They want to take the assistance to unemployed Americans—800,000 of them in my home State, millions across the Nation—and cut it in half. Did Senator MCCONNELL get a news flash that I missed that mortgage payments will be cut in half as of tomorrow, that rental payments will be cut in half as of tomorrow, that car payments will be cut in half, that the cost of food will be cut in half? Not at all.

We know these families will face the same obligations and, under the Republican proposal, receive a fraction of what they were given and have received between March and the end of July. That is unfair to these families.

I know what is happening in food banks across Illinois, and I am sure it is the same case in Kentucky, perhaps in Georgia, perhaps in New York. People are flooding these food banks asking for help. Some of them are embarrassed by their situation. They shouldn't be, but they are. Many people who used to volunteer at these same food banks are now standing in line, looking at their shoes, hoping to take enough food home to make it through a week.

That is the reality, but it is not the reality that is reflected in the Senate action this week. What we have from Senator MCCONNELL is a small effort at a time when America needs a substantial effort to deal with not only the situation facing our economy but also the coronavirus.

I am troubled, too, because I represent a State that is so diverse, with the great city of Chicago but all the way downstate—my roots—smalltown America, rural America. Many of the

hospitals and healthcare providers in those areas are literally struggling to survive. They are looking to Washington for a helping hand. Do you know what it means to smalltown America to lose a hospital? It is devastating, not only from the viewpoint of healthcare and emergency care, which is unavailable on a timely basis in many places, but also because it is hard to keep a business or attract a business if you don't have quality healthcare nearby. Many of those hospitals are struggling to keep the lights on and survive, and they will not make it unless we step up.

So what is included in the Republican proposal when it comes to these healthcare providers, to increasing Medicaid assistance to them, for example? Virtually nothing. I can't understand this. I have to believe that the Republican leadership representing States with small towns and rural populations are hearing exactly what I am hearing in downstate Illinois. Yet, when it comes to a proposal on the floor, they are doing nothing—nothing.

Let me just add, in closing here, if we don't take testing seriously in America, we cannot be serious about reopening the economy, reopening schools, from colleges to kindergartens. That is the reality, to be able to test in an effective, cost-effective way people who are positive for this virus so that they are notified and stop from circulating among those who are, at that point, healthy.

The testing investment by this bill on the Republican side doesn't meet the challenge at all. They can't call for opening the economy on one hand and ignore the responsibility for testing on another.

So where do we go from here? Well, tomorrow is a symbolic, partisan vote on the Republican side when it should be much more. After it is finished and we know the outcome, perhaps then the Republican leader in the Senate will be willing to sit down and negotiate. Will he be willing to occupy that empty chair in that negotiating room with the White House and Democratic congressional leaders? Will he be willing to sit down and actually work on a compromise comparable to the CARES Act that passed here in March, earlier this year?

That is what it takes—not a speech on the floor, not a press release, not a symbolic vote but something much more significant: the willingness to sit down and acknowledge the obvious; that America is heading in the wrong direction, and we should be heading in the right direction.

Many people worry that the worst is yet to come. We want them to be more hopeful and optimistic because we care, and if both parties do care to help the unemployed, to help businesses, to make sure that our healthcare providers have the resources that they need, then we can start to address this coronavirus, this pandemic, with the leadership that has been so lacking in

the months that we have faced it this year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, starting this week and tomorrow, there will be a vote on a coronavirus relief bill, and it is a bill that is targeted to the areas that really need it, it is fiscally responsible, and it is rooted in reality. In other words, it is a realistic approach to dealing with the coronavirus challenges that we, as a nation, are facing.

The Democratic leader and the Democratic assistant leader have been down here just now talking about the Democratic bill, a bill which passed the House of Representatives and a bill that was \$3½ trillion in terms of its pricetag and a bill that was filled with goodies for special-interest groups and lots of leftwing priorities, many of which have nothing to do at all with the coronavirus.

In fact, \$3½ trillion is a number that I think was pulled out of thin air. I have no idea how they came up with it. I don't think it was based on any feedback or input that they got from States or businesses around the country. I think it was let's just make up as many things as we can and let's just throw a lot of money out there and see what it does.

Well, unfortunately, I think people have come to the realization—people around the country, at least—that every dollar that we spend now is a borrowed dollar. So the \$3½ trillion that was allocated by the House Democrats and which has been supported just in the last few minutes here by the Democratic leader and the Democratic whip is borrowed money. It should come as no surprise to anybody in this country that our country already is deeply in debt. We added about \$3 trillion earlier this year when we passed the CARES package—at the time, something that was needed. We needed to be big and bold and move quickly, which we did.

We have a much better sense now, I think, about this disease, what the needs are, and we ought to be targeting our assistance to those areas of greatest need, whether it is small businesses that need assistance, that haven't been able to reopen; whether it is in the area of healthcare, our hospitals and nursing homes, the provider community; or whether it is supporting the efforts that are being made to come up with vaccines and therapeutics, the money that is going into testing. Those are all things I think that there was pretty broad agreement on at the time. We still believe those are things that are essential, in addition to supporting our schools as they try to safely reopen.

There are a number of priorities out there that I do think we have learned, gotten more information about, and determined where the dollars made the most difference, what could be changed and modified in these programs to

make them more workable, and that is what has led to the discussion we are having now and the bill that we will vote on tomorrow.

What the Democrats, in their bill—the \$3½ trillion bill—did was they just decided that money is no object and evidently without, again, much consideration about how those dollars are spent or in any way making sure that they are targeted to the right area, to those areas of greatest need, just basically decided to kind of throw caution to the wind and throw \$3½ trillion out there at the economy.

The ironic thing about it, in many respects, is that, without having feedback or input, for example, from State and local governments about how much they needed, they put another \$1 trillion into that bill—\$1 trillion for State and local governments—at a time when very little of the \$150 billion that we had already done in direct assistance, not to mention the additional assistance to States, to education, to colleges and universities, elementary and secondary education, healthcare providers—a lot of additional dollars have gone through the States, to the tune of about a half a trillion dollars already, much of which hasn't been spent. In fact, of the \$150 billion in direct assistance that went out to State and local governments—the latest numbers I had as recently as about a week ago—only about a quarter of that, about 25 percent of that money had been spent. Yet they were asking for another trillion dollars, every single dollar of which is borrowed.

It was just reported recently that, in 2021, the United States will exceed 100 percent debt to GDP. That puts us in the elite and rare company of Italy, Greece, Japan, countries around the world that have gotten dramatically overextended when it comes to their sovereign debt. When you get to the debt to GDP which is in excess of 100 percent, that is pretty dangerous territory.

Everybody says we are the best economy in the world, we are the world's reserve currency, and people are going to continue to want to invest here in the United States. Well, at some point there are consequences. The chickens do come home to roost. You cannot continue to borrow without eventual consequence. At some point, interest rates will start to normalize, at which time these countries that invest in the United States are going to demand a higher return. Interest rates—when they go up, it means the amount we have to pay to borrow money goes up, and when our interest gets north of \$1 trillion, it will exceed every other item in our budget, including the amount that we spend for national security.

So that is the other part of the debate which the other side never references; that is, what are we doing to the long-term future of this country, to our children and grandchildren, all of whom are going to be responsible for this debt? We are essentially doing everything we do right now—putting it

on the credit card and handing the bill to our children and grandchildren—which is to say that the Republicans believe that we ought to do coronavirus relief and help those who need it. I am going to talk in just a moment about all the things that this bill does to help those who really need the help, but it ought to be targeted. It ought to be with some thought toward what is the greatest need? where can we make the biggest difference? where can we help the people who are really struggling and really hurting as a result of the virus, the pandemic? And we ought to do it in a fiscally responsible way. We ought to do it in a realistic way. We ought to have a bill that is, frankly, rooted in reality.

The reason I say that the Democratic bill isn't rooted in reality is because of many of the things that it contained. In fact, there were more mentions of the word “cannabis” in the Democratic bill than there were mentions of the word “jobs”—more mentions of the word “cannabis,” a synonym for marijuana, than mentions of the word “jobs.”

So if you think about that, the 58 mentions in the Democratic \$3½ trillion bill had to do, for example, with diversity training. This was a study that was requested—I shouldn't say “diversity training” but a diversity study in the access to financing for people who are in the marijuana business. That was something that was determined a priority and funded in the Democratic-passed bill.

Now, that is just one of many examples of why that bill wasn't taken seriously by anyone. When I say “anyone,” I am talking about the New York Times. The New York Times called it a messaging document and not a viable piece of legislation. The New York Times called it a messaging document and not a viable piece of legislation. National Public Radio said that it was a wish list—a Democratic wish list—of favored policies. POLITICO called it a long wish list of Democratic policies. Nobody—nobody took the Democratic bill seriously. When you can't get the New York Times to speak favorably about a Democratic coronavirus relief bill, it tells me that it was completely out of step and out of touch with what is really needed in this country and, certainly, by the people in this country who do want to see us respond but respond in a way—again, as I said—that is targeted and is fiscally responsible and doesn't throw any kind of fiscal caution to the wind, that just throws money out there at a lot of favored pet causes and ideological agenda items on the Democratic wish list. That is essentially what that bill did.

So as we decided to put together a bill, we listened carefully. We listened to small businesses. We listened to healthcare providers. We listened to schools, to school administrators. We listened to those folks who are impacted on a daily basis by the effects of this pandemic and what is really need-

ed, where are those greatest needs, where can we make the biggest difference.

This is, again, the focus of the Republican bill that we will be voting on tomorrow, which, contrary to the assertions that were made by the Democratic leader, does include a lot of bipartisan policy and bipartisan cooperation. Many of the provisions in the bill are provisions that share Democratic cosponsorship. In fact, I would point out that the changes we made to the PPP program—the PPP program, which is an acronym for the Paycheck Protection Program, is one of the most successful of all the programs in the CARES Act that passed earlier this year. It was a very bipartisan effort shared with people like MARCO RUBIO and SUSAN COLLINS on our side and BEN CARDIN and JEANNE SHAHEEN on the Democratic side and others involved in shaping that program, making it effective. Subsequent to that, changes made it work even better, and this will include some changes that we think will make it work even better.

There are some in here that I, frankly, was very supportive of because they will help people who, under the last Paycheck Protection Program, didn't receive help because, for one reason or another, they were excluded from the qualifications to make them eligible for it.

It makes changes in the Paycheck Protection Program, many of which—again, this is a bipartisan program—will be bipartisan in nature. There were a number of things that the leader mentioned over here this morning earlier when he was on the floor in which he talked about some of the provisions that Senator ALEXANDER had added. There are things in that space that, again, share bipartisan support. So if you look at this bill, in many respects the Democrats are also saying that we need to do more to help our schools open safely, and this legislation does that. There is significant funding in here that actually helps out—makes sure that our schools, our administrators, our school boards, our students, our parents are assisted in a way that would see that our schools open safely and get our children back to where they can be learning again at the fastest rate possible.

Those are, again, some of the priorities that were in this legislation. I would add, because I think it is really worthwhile noting, that one of the provisions in this bill does take dollars from the CARES Act that have not been spent and, frankly, may not be spent and repurposes them so that the cost of this particular piece of legislation is reduced—something, again, that I think is important. I think it is important to the American people and it is important to our kids and grandkids as we look at the pricetags we have been talking about—the \$3 trillion that was done earlier this year, and what we might do here—that we do it in a way that is fiscally responsible, with con-

sideration and an eye toward ensuring that the taxpayers are getting the best return on their dollars and that we are being good stewards of the American tax dollars and spending in a way that makes sense and doesn't just throw money out there, which, again, is what I would argue the \$3.5 trillion bill proposed by the House Democrats did—a bill which, again, was roundly denounced not just by Republicans or conservatives but by entities like the New York Times.

I want to speak very briefly about what is happening out there—why I think this bill and this vote is important and why I believe it addresses the real needs, based on the input that we have received from the people out there who have been adversely impacted by this.

The good news is we are hearing continually improving numbers on the economy—as recently as last Friday. The economy added 1.4 million jobs in August, and the unemployment rate fell again to 8.4 percent.

Let me just be clear: 8.4 percent is not where we want to be. But it is a tremendous improvement from where we were just 4 months ago, near the beginning of the pandemic when the unemployment rate was at 14.7 percent. It is very encouraging to see the economy rebounding so quickly.

The last time America went through a really tough time economically—during the first few years of the Obama-Biden administration—unemployment stayed high for years. In fact, during the Obama-Biden administration, America went through 2 solid years of unemployment that was above 9 percent.

It has been great to see the economy rebounding at a rapid pace. Again, we are still a long way from where we need to be and where we want to be; 8.4 percent is not an acceptable unemployment rate. But we are definitely on the right track.

One of the reasons our economy is rebounding quickly is that the economy was thriving before COVID came along. Republican tax reform and pro-growth policies had driven unemployment below 4 percent and created jobs and opportunities for millions of Americans. Having the economy in a healthy position pre-COVID laid the groundwork for a strong recovery. The policies we put in place during the early years in the pandemic to help businesses—particularly small businesses—survive the pandemic and keep workers on the payroll have gone a long way toward helping our economy rebound.

Republicans are committed to building on those policies, but as everyone knows, Democrats have so far blocked our efforts. Despite weeks of negotiating efforts from Republicans, Democrats refused to budge from their demands for a giant bill that would spend an irresponsible amount of taxpayer money and include a bunch of measures with no relation to the coronavirus crisis.

This week, Republicans are trying again. We have introduced a targeted bill focused on a few key coronavirus priorities—like helping the hardest hit small businesses, getting kids and college students back to school, and providing additional healthcare resources to fight the virus.

As I mentioned earlier, the Paycheck Protection Program, a program Congress passed as part of the CARES Act back in March, has played a key role in helping small businesses survive the pandemic.

The legislation we have introduced would authorize a second round of forgivable Paycheck Protection Program loans for the hardest hit small businesses but would also simplify the loan forgiveness process for small businesses with Paycheck Protection Program loans of \$150,000 or less. Again, I would point out that this program, these changes, share bipartisan support.

The virus has highlighted how much we rely on our Nation's farmers and ranchers, and I am pleased our legislation includes an additional \$20 billion in funding to allow the Department of Agriculture to continue to assist ag producers—again, a bipartisan priority.

Our legislation would also provide for an additional \$300 per week—over and above unemployment benefits—for those who have lost their jobs as a result of the pandemic.

Our bill contains another important measure to help keep our recovery going and to protect jobs, and that is liability protection.

No matter how many precautions schools, hospitals, and businesses take, there is no way—no way—for them to completely eliminate all risk of employees, students, or customers contracting the virus. But that doesn't matter to the army of trial lawyers itching to levy lawsuits against even the most careful schools and businesses. I don't need to tell anybody that saddling businesses large and small with a bunch of frivolous lawsuits could seriously hamstring our economic recovery.

There is no question that schools and businesses should be liable for gross negligence or for intentional misconduct. But businesses and schools that are taking every reasonable precaution to protect employees and students should not have to worry about facing lawsuits for virus transmission that they could not have prevented.

In addition to providing schools with liability protections, our bill focuses on providing schools with the resources they need to get kids and teachers back in classrooms safely. Our bill would help expand the educational options that parents have for their children. And it would provide increased funding for childcare during this crisis so that parents who are trying to get back to work have a safe place to send their kids.

Finally, our bill would provide more money for coronavirus testing and tracing and for the development of the

therapies and vaccines we need to defeat this virus. And it would focus on building up State and national stockpiles of the medical resources needed for public health emergencies like the coronavirus.

I would like to think that Democrats would work with us to get a version of our legislation passed this week. While this bill may not address every current or future coronavirus need, it would go a long way toward helping with our most pressing needs—supporting jobs, getting kids and teachers back to school, and ensuring that we have the medical resources necessary to fight the virus.

Unfortunately, it has become very clear that Democrats are more interested in keeping the coronavirus as a political issue than in actually fighting the virus. If Democrats were serious about coronavirus relief, they would be willing to negotiate with Republicans to arrive at a bill that both sides could agree to and that could actually pass Congress. But they have made it very clear that reasonable negotiations are off the table. Instead, they are content to see Americans suffer or our economic recovery slow in the hopes that they will be able to use the coronavirus as a political issue in the November elections.

It is disappointing, but it is not going to stop Republicans from continuing to try to pass coronavirus relief legislation. The American people are depending on us, and we are going to do everything we can not to let them down.

I hope that at least some Democrats will decide that they should join us.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last several months, Texans have found new and creative ways to connect with one another while following the necessary COVID-19 precautions—things like drive-through birthday parties, live-streamed weddings, virtual family reunions, and socially distanced barbecues. Life looks a lot different today than it did at the start of the year, but despite the challenges we face, we know it is unrealistic to hit the pause button until the pandemic subsides.

While COVID-19 continues to be ever present in our daily lives, folks across my State are safely adapting their routines, and that certainly has been my objective in the Senate. Over the past few months, I, like many of my colleagues—maybe all of my colleagues—have largely replaced in-person conversations with virtual ones, through more than 150 separate calls with groups across the State of Texas. These virtual conversations continued over the month of August, along with a number of socially distanced events complete with all of the CDC precautions. Close communication with my constituents has always been important, and the COVID pandemic has made these conversations even more critical.

During August, I spent time hearing from my constituents, learning about their challenges and what they need in the way of additional help. I donned my mask—like we all have—to safely meet with city leaders, teachers, healthcare heroes, food bank workers, and others across the State. I continued to join telephone and video calls with Texans whose routines and livelihoods have been disrupted by the pandemic.

It actually was an exhilarating opportunity to get out from behind my computer screen and to share information about the coronavirus relief bills that we have passed thus far but to learn also, just as significantly, where those bills were working and where more needed to be done. As the Senate prepares to vote on a targeted relief bill tomorrow, these discussions could not have been more timely.

I also hosted recently four telephone townhalls with constituents across Texas. This is amazing technology, as the Presiding Officer knows, where you can reach out to a quarter of a million people just in an hour-long phone call and give them a chance to express their views or ask questions.

I heard from parents who are concerned about the start of the school year; small business owners who are trying to stay afloat, not knowing when all of this will end; and a woman in rural Texas who is worried that if the U.S. Postal Service goes under, she will not be able to receive her medication in the mail.

This is a difficult time for many of our neighbors, and I was glad to share the information about the resources we provided and to answer questions about what Texans might be able to expect in the next relief bill.

One of the most commonly asked questions was about unemployment insurance. Since March, more than 3.4 million Texans have filed for unemployment compensation, and many were able to take advantage of the extra \$600 a week in Federal benefits provided by the CARES Act. But that extra funding expired at the end of July, leaving many Texans who were still unable to return to work without the income they need to support their families.

Despite our repeated efforts, Congress has been unable and unwilling to come up with an agreement on unemployment benefits before the month of August. As a gap-filler, the President issued an Executive order to provide an extra \$300 a week in benefits, which Texans have received. This is good news for those who came to rely on these bolstered benefits, but, unfortunately, it doesn't help them with the same level of certainty that congressional legislation would provide. The next relief bill must provide those who are still without a way to earn a paycheck the additional benefits they need to replace their income.

It is important that we agree to an amount or a formula that doesn't

hinder our economic recovery or perversely incentivize people not to go back to work safely. Over the last month, I have heard from a number of employers who had trouble rehiring workers because in some cases their workers were earning more with the additional \$600 benefit than they would from working. Well, it just doesn't make any sense to incentivize people not to go back to work when they can safely do so. We need to strike a delicate balance that gives them the resources they need to support their family without incentivizing them to stay home.

As businesses have reopened and employees returned to work, Texas has made serious progress in getting more folks back on the payroll. The State unemployment rate has steadily declined from a peak of 13.5 percent to 8 percent in July. Obviously, that is still way too high and a far cry from the 3.5 percent we saw pre-COVID. If we are going to keep working and moving in the right direction, we need to have our workers return to work when that becomes an option. Obviously it goes without saying that they would be able to safely return.

Of course, it is not enough to just give people the resources they need to support their families; we also need to ensure they have jobs to return to. That is why the Paycheck Protection Program has been so vital and has saved countless jobs since it was established in March through the CARES Act. So far, Congress has invested \$670 billion in this job-saving program, and I am glad to say that Texas has received more than \$41 billion across more than 417,000 individual loans. It has literally been a lifesaver for many of these small businesses. I hope the next relief bill will provide an opportunity for the hardest hit businesses to receive a second PPP loan and save even more jobs and small businesses in communities not just across my State but across the United States.

Our State also has a vibrant arts and culture scene, and some of the hardest hit businesses are live-event venues. These were actually some of the first to close when the pandemic hit, and they will be the last to reopen. Unlike restaurants or retailers, which were able to switch to curbside or pickup delivery, event venues don't offer a service that can be tailored to meet the CDC guidelines.

The experience of a concert at the Lowbrow Palace in El Paso or a trip to hear the symphony at the Meyerson in Dallas isn't the same through a computer screen. That leaves no opportunity for live venue operators, promoters, producers, and talent representatives to organize events and no chance for security guards, ticket takers, bartenders, or cleanup crews to earn a paycheck.

These venues are not only a special part of our culture and our communities, they are also major employers and fuel our economic engine. Pro-

viding relief for these venues is an important way to protect our local economies, jobs, and beloved cultural institutions. That is why I introduced the Save our Stages Act with Senator KLOBUCHAR, our colleague from Minnesota. It would establish a \$10 billion grant program to give independent venues and their employees the funding they need to survive this pandemic. We are not talking about huge, publicly traded, multinational corporations here. In order to be eligible, recipients must have fewer than 500 employees and can't be publicly traded. They can use the money to cover payroll and benefits, as well as rent, utilities, and other expenses to stay afloat. As the Senate continues to work on our next coronavirus relief bill, I hope the Save Our Stages provision will be included.

Our economy in Texas, like the rest of the country, is moving in a more positive direction. We want to keep it this way. We need to do everything we can to ensure that once the pandemic is contained, our cultural institutions, our businesses, and our jobs that we rely on will be ready to bounce back. I appreciate the countless Texans who shared with me their feedback and ideas on how Congress can do more to support our State and our country through this crisis. I am going to do my part to keep fighting to enact these ideas into law and give Texans the support they deserve.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. CORNYN. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 159 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Casey	Fischer
Baldwin	Cassidy	Gardner
Barrasso	Collins	Gillibrand
Bennet	Coons	Graham
Blackburn	Cornyn	Grassley
Blumenthal	Cortez Masto	Hassan
Blunt	Cotton	Hawley
Booker	Cramer	Heinrich
Boozman	Crapo	Hoehn
Braun	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Brown	Daines	Inhofe
Burr	Duckworth	Johnson
Cantwell	Durbin	Jones
Capito	Enzi	Kaine
Cardin	Ernst	Kennedy
Carper	Feinstein	King

Lankford	Peters	Sinema
Leahy	Portman	Smith
Lee	Reed	Sullivan
Loeffler	Risch	Tester
Manchin	Roberts	Thune
McConnell	Romney	Tillis
McSally	Rosen	Toomey
Menendez	Rounds	Udall
Merkley	Rubio	Van Hollen
Moran	Sasse	Warner
Murkowski	Schumer	Whitehouse
Murphy	Scott (FL)	Wicker
Murray	Scott (SC)	Young
Paul	Shaheen	
Perdue	Shelby	

NAYS—5

Hirono	Schatz	Wyden
Markey	Warren	

NOT VOTING—4

Harris	Sanders
Klobuchar	Stabenow

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 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 Christy Criswell Wiegand, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, John Boozman, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Crapo, Mitt Romney, John Barrasso, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, Lindsey Graham, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott.

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 Christy Criswell Wiegand, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, 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 California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 80, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Ex.]

YEAS—80

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

NAYS—16

Blumenthal	Markey	Smith
Booker	Menendez	Van Hollen
Brown	Merkley	Warren
Cantwell	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Schatz	
Hirono	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—4

Harris	Sanders
Klobuchar	Stabenow

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 80, the nays are 16.

The motion is agreed to.

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 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 Hala Y. Jarbou, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

Mitch McConnell, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Tom Cotton, Marsha Blackburn, Kevin Cramer, Jerry Moran, James E. Risch, Michael B. Enzi, Tim Scott, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, Deb Fischer, James Lankford, John Thune, Steve Daines, Joni Ernst, John Hoeven.

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 Hala Y. Jarbou, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan, 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 Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS),

the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 80, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Ex.]

YEAS—80

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

NAYS—15

Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Markey	Schumer
Brown	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Harris	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 80, the nays are 15.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Hala Y. Jarbou, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:10 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SASSE).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON WIEGAND NOMINATION

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

The question is, Shall the Senate advise and consent to the Wiegand nomination?

Mr. CORNYN. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

(Mr. DAINES assumed the Chair.)

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

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 162 Ex.]

YEAS—82

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

NAYS—14

Blumenthal	Menendez	Smith
Booker	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Schatz	Wyden
Markey	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—4

Harris	Sanders
Klobuchar	Stabenow

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 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 Thomas T. Cullen, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia.

Mitch McConnell, Richard C. Shelby, Lamar Alexander, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Marsha Blackburn, David

Perdue, Kevin Cramer, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Cory Gardner, Roy Blunt, Martha McSally, John Barrasso, John Boozman.

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 Thomas T. Cullen, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 163 Ex.]

YEAS—77

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

NAYS—18

Bennet	Hirono	Schumer
Blumenthal	Markey	Smith
Booker	Menendez	Udall
Cantwell	Merkley	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Murray	Warren
Heinrich	Schatz	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Baldwin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Harris	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 77, the nays are 18.

The motion is agreed to.

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 Diane Gujarati, of New York, to be

United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt.

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 Diane Gujarati, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 164 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Fischer	Peters
Baldwin	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Reed
Bennet	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Booker	Heinrich	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Jones	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kennedy	Shaheen
Carper	King	Shelby
Casey	Lankford	Sinema
Cassidy	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Lee	Sullivan
Coons	Loeffler	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Cramer	McSally	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Warner
Cruz	Merkley	Warren
Daines	Moran	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murkowski	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Enzi	Murray	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Feinstein	Perdue	

NAYS—2

Hirono	Van Hollen
--------	------------

NOT VOTING—4

Harris	Sanders
Klobuchar	Stabenow

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 2.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Diane Gujarati,

of New York, to be United States District Judge for Eastern District of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, for the past several weeks I have had the opportunity to be able to travel around the great State of Oklahoma. I have literally been from Guymon to Talihina, to Bartlesville, to Lawton to cover as much space as I could and talk to as many people as I could.

Obviously, we were in smaller groups, with masks and social distancing and doing all the things we could to take care of each other, but taking the moment to meet with school superintendents, parents, teachers, healthcare providers and hospital administrators, small business owners and employees of large and small businesses, not-for-profits and their volunteers, law enforcement individuals, city managers, mayors, city councilmen, State leadership.

I wanted to hear what was happening on the ground in my State in order to know what needs to be addressed because there has been a lot of noise in Washington, DC, about what needs to be done on COVID.

There are many people in the national press who are struck by the fact that \$3 trillion has already been allocated to deal with COVID-19 and a tremendous number of changes have already occurred. But in this town there are a significant number of people who say: We just spent \$3 trillion. That was fun. Let's do it all over again and see how we can spend even more.

My focus has been very simple: What is needed to be able to beat the virus? What I heard all over Oklahoma wasn't "Go do more; just spend more and create new programs" but "How can we beat this virus back so that we can actually get to a moment where we can function again economically as a nation?"

People are returning to work, but they are asking very basic questions. The first of those is "This is a health crisis. What do we do?"

The bill that has just been released, which we are voting on in the Senate tomorrow, has a whole series of issues tailored to actually work on beating the virus back and getting our economy going and helping to protect our families. That is the design of this. It is not just doing something; it is trying to do the right things to actually help us get through this and get to the other side, starting with money for testing—not just additional testing but new types of testing to make sure that we have even faster tests out there and that we have more testing that actually addresses the issue of how we can do it on-site, get an accurate result, and not wait weeks. While we literally have millions of tests that have been done, we have some tests that take a long time to get back. In March, we were dealing with "Let's get a test,"

and now we are dealing with “Let’s get a faster test.” That is a lot of the focus of the funding here: faster testing.

On vaccines, there are six vaccines right now that are in human trials or that are approaching human trials, which is remarkable, thinking about the history of vaccines and how long it has taken. But there was a significant amount of money invested in this in February and March in previous bills to be able to fast-track the research, and that has made a difference. Now it is a matter of moving it from the research phase to trials to actually implementing it nationwide. So there is significant money for testing, for vaccines, and for treatments.

Secondly, how do we get our schools open again? I heard over and over again from parents, administrators, and teachers: We want to get our schools open again—public, private, charter, online, whatever it may be. Those parents who are taxpayers and individuals—regardless of where they choose to send their child to school or if they choose to keep their child at home for school—want to know what is going to be done to help our kids get educated. While the vast majority of funding and authority for education is in the States, there is a Federal connection here that we should be able to help, especially kids with special needs. They have unique challenges during this time of COVID-19, and we need to be able to get those kids back in school and get them the additional care they need during this time period.

What all parents are saying to me is this: I want the best possible moment. I do not want my kid being written off for the future because someone didn’t choose to invest in them now.

This bill has \$105 billion toward education—public, private, charter, homeschool. It has tax credits built in to assist parents to be able to choose where they want their kids to go. It has the ability for more schools to go online to help through this season. It has additional dollars to be used for transportation because many school districts are doing multiple bus routes to keep down the number of people on individual buses. All of those things are helpful. We want to help get our kids back in school and make sure that this is successful.

During this moment, it has been interesting. As I talked to many superintendents and educators, they all said to me the same thing: We are working hard to get our kids back to class and to do the things they need to do.

Then they would pause and say: For years we have talked about innovation in education, but we have been stuck doing the same thing over and over again and have been frustrated with the results. This pandemic has forced us to innovate in education in ways that we only dreamed about years ago. We need to be prepared during this season not only to continue to educate our kids in the best way possible but to take notes on the best innovations

across the country in education because we have said as a nation that we need to be stronger in how we are educating our kids and the end product of that and how we are preparing them for the workforce. This is that moment we should pay attention to, as well, in the education innovations that are actually going on in my State and in many States around the country.

There is money in this, as well, for childcare. This has been an interesting challenge. Childcare facilities have fewer people who are actually allowed to be there—the children who are able to be there—but the profit margin doesn’t work for them to have all those employees and fewer children. We want them to be able to be there and be successful and survive this, so we added additional dollars for childcare.

We have additional dollars for agriculture in some areas of agriculture across the country, they have done very well, but some have really struggled. If we all want to be able to eat at the end of this, we better make sure that agriculture survives and thrives through this.

I met with a lot of small business leaders and heard a lot of different conversations. They were very appreciative of the Paycheck Protection Program. In my State, 61,000 small businesses and not-for-profits took advantage of the Paycheck Protection Program, and many of them told me that they would not be open today if it weren’t for that. They are grateful this body came together to deal with the Paycheck Protection Program because it made a difference in my State and many other States around the country.

The bill we are putting on the floor on Thursday deals specifically with the next round of paycheck protection, limiting it to the hardest hit small businesses and nonprofits, those that have had the largest amount of revenue loss and that are the smallest of businesses. We need them to be able to survive through this. Nothing is going to make them whole, and the goal of this shouldn’t be to make every business whole. We can’t financially sustain that as a country, but we can try to get people through this and get to the other side of it.

We are all going to have to innovate. Most of the small businesses that I talked to told me about the innovations they were doing and how they used to do business one way, and, within 36 hours, they figured out a way to do it a different way. That is the American system. That is free market and capitalism at their best—that at the moment of struggle, you can go innovate and do things different and be successful with that. That is what we have to continue to protect—not too much government oversight and control of everything that, in the days and moments where we have to innovate, people can’t innovate because they have so much government mandates on them.

I was grateful to the Trump administration for how much flexibility they

gave to the process, not only to waivers for child lunches through the schools and flexibility there, but flexibility for businesses to be able to innovate in a very difficult moment.

We will need another round—a smaller round, but another round—for the hardest hit businesses for the Paycheck Protection Program. Our not-for-profits told me over and over how much work they are doing during this time period. We need to make sure those not-for-profits not only survive it but thrive.

As I have said to this body before, we have three safety nets in America: the family; churches, not-for-profits, and faith-based institutions; and then government is third. A lot of people look at our safety net as being all the government programs, but that is the last in this cycle. If our families aren’t strong, then individuals struggle. If our faith-based entities and our not-for-profits that take care of so much human need are not strong and thriving and those volunteers aren’t engaged, there is no way the government can keep up with the issues.

So just keeping not-for-profits open can’t be the goal for this. We have to keep them thriving. Those not-for-profits around the country are taking care of the homeless, the hungry, and the hurting, and we need to find ways to strengthen them. The best way to do that is not to have some government program to establish the best way to identify good not-for-profits. The best way to do that is to allow the American people to look at what is working in their neighborhoods and their communities, because they will invest their own dollars to do that.

In the CARES Act, I pushed for and we got a \$300 write-off on your taxes if every American will give \$300 to the not-for-profit of their choice. In this proposal, that doubles for the individuals and quadruples for the family. This is a \$600 tax write-off for an individual or a \$1,200 tax write-off for a family if they will donate to a not-for-profit.

Why do we choose to do that? Because not-for-profits are way more efficient at taking care of human need than the government is and because they have a face. They are interacting with a family. They are interacting with an individual directly. They are not dealing with someone on the phone or online. It is not a check that you receive or a form that you fill out. It is a person that you meet with face to face who says: How can I help you? And it is a volunteer that will walk through life with you.

Those faith-based ministries and those secular and other not-for-profits out there are making an enormous difference, and the best thing that we can do to make sure they thrive in this moment is to make sure that we incentivize individuals that give to them by saying: You can give this to Uncle Sam or you can give this to a local charity of your choice. Either

way, it is going to strengthen individuals. Go engage with that.

That is in this bill, and it is important that we continue to walk alongside them and all of those not-for-profits to make sure they thrive because we need them thriving, not just surviving in this moment.

There is one other thing that I want to identify. There are a lot of things that are in this bill. It is liability protections. Businesses and universities in my State said: We desperately need the Federal Government to clarify liability protections.

Now, there have been individuals on the other side of the aisle that have said: We don't want to do that. We want to just leave that up to the lawyers in the days ahead who have lawsuits. What is occurring is there are many businesses in my State that are holding back and many schools in my State that are holding back trying to figure out what happens next for fear of what could be a series of lawsuits. They just want clarity. They want to do business where they can protect their employees, protect the customers or individuals or students that are there that are around them, but they also want to be able to operate and function again, and they don't feel like they can do that without basic liability protections and liability definitions. This bill provides that.

Now, I have heard some in the media and some even in this building who have said this is a pared-down skinny bill. Only in Washington, DC, is a \$300 billion piece of legislation considered skinny—only here. Over and over again at home, when I talk to people across the State of Oklahoma and I would present what has already been done in the previous acts—the \$3 trillion that have already been spent on COVID in the months before and the proposals that we have now—they would quietly pull me aside at the end of the meeting and they would say almost exactly the same thing: Where is this money coming from?

People are worried about the virus, but they are also worried about what is coming next. People are used to taking out a loan if there is a major storm or a major life event, knowing I have to take this loan out to get through it, but they also realize that for every loan they take out, they have to pay that back. The people in my State are saying the same thing: Where is this money coming from? How are we ever going to pay it back? And they are shocked that the House of Representatives and many in this room are pushing a bill that is \$3.5 trillion in spending on top of the \$3 trillion that was already spent earlier this year, and they just gasp when they think about an additional \$6.5 trillion of deficit in a single year. They wonder what happens with that, and I respond to them: So do I. That is why we are trying to be as tailored and as focused as we can possibly be to meet the needs that need to be done but to not just throw a big

number out and to say we have to go big. We already have gone big earlier this year.

Now, it is not just “can we throw money out the door from Washington, DC,” but it is “what do we have to do to get to the other side of this for our health, for our students, for the basic operations of our economy and survival to be able to get on the other side of this,” because on the other side of this is a bill that has to be paid.

We, in this body, should pay attention to that because, certainly, the people in Oklahoma are paying attention to that and so should we. There are things that need to be done, and I look forward to bringing this up to be able to focus on the essential things that need to be done for our economy right now and be able to keep moving from there.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

COVID-19 VACCINE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, this morning, our Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee had a hearing, and one of the members came up to me on the floor and said: That was the most civil hearing I have attended in the Senate in a while. The truth is that most of our hearings in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee are civil. We have Senators of widely different points of view.

I thank Senator MURRAY, the Senator from Washington State, who is the ranking member of our committee and a member of the Democratic leadership, for the way that she and the Democratic members of the committee worked with the Republican members so that we can have the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Adams, and Dr. Francis Collins, the head of the National Institutes of Health, who is one of our country's most esteemed scientists and the man who headed the human genome project, there for 3 hours and we can ask questions. Virtually every Senator participated, and we got some good answers.

I would like to report to the other members of the Senate about that hearing. I began it by saying: I have been rereading the book “Guns, Germs, and Steel,” a book by Jared Diamond, written in 1997, which is as relevant today—maybe more relevant today—than it was when he wrote it.

Mr. Diamond, who won the Pulitzer Prize and is a professor of geography in California, said: There is nothing new about mass epidemics that causes deaths and social upheaval that we are witnessing today, and there is nothing new about where most of those

epidemics in history have come from. Diseases that caused those deaths for the last 10,000 years, he says, have come mostly from animals that transmit them to humans, and during most of history, there were three ways to deal with these epidemics.

One was to isolate the infected, as in, for example, leper colonies to deal with leprosy. One was, according to Mr. Diamond, that over thousands of years, there have been genetic changes in the human population in response to the infectious diseases that have gone through those populations, and they have produced a resistance to the infectious diseases, as in the case of smallpox. Of course, that didn't do much to help the Native Americans in this country when European settlers, who had some resistance to smallpox, arrived here and gave blankets to the Native Americans that were infected with smallpox or contained smallpox and wiped out 90 percent of the tribes who received them because they didn't have that resistance.

There is a third way of dealing with epidemics. Throughout most of history, the most common way was to let the epidemic run through the population until everyone had been either killed or recovered and developed some resistance to the disease. Diamond says that the Black Death killed about one-third of Europe's population between 1347 and 1351 as it ran through the population killing people.

Now, what is new about dealing with epidemics is modern medicine. Modern medicine has given us ways to diagnose these diseases and to create treatments to make it easier to recover from these diseases, but the true miracle of modern medicine is the vaccine—a vaccine that can prevent humans from acquiring the disease at all. The Senator from Tennessee and I have actually worked together on that issue 2 or 3 years ago to encourage people, and, in her words, talk to your doctor if you have a concern about a vaccine. That is what we want to talk about today.

Today, in all 50 States and the District of Columbia, school children are required to take vaccinations for a series of diseases—diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, measles, rubella, and chicken pox—before entering school.

That vaccination will protect the child from getting the disease, which in turn prevents the child from infecting someone else—a pattern that eventually causes these diseases to disappear.

Americans of my generation remember how polio terrified our parents in the early 1940s and into the 1950s. Many saw their children die of polio. When I was very young, I can remember classmates who were strapped into iron lungs so they could breathe and were destined to stay there for the rest of their lives. The lucky ones were like Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, who was left only with a limp after having polio in the 1940s.

The disease terrified Americans until Dr. Jonas Salk discovered the polio

vaccine in 1955. After the vaccine was developed, the United States undertook a large-scale vaccination campaign, and polio was declared eradicated from the United States by 1979.

The purpose of the hearing we had this morning was to explore the remarkable progression that science is making toward a COVID-19 vaccine and to remind parents to have their children get their childhood vaccinations and to encourage as many Americans as possible to take the flu vaccine this fall.

First, the progress toward the COVID-19 vaccination—Dr. Collins, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, talked about that. He talked about the vaccine research and development, including Operation Warp Speed, which is working to develop, manufacture, and distribute safe and effective vaccines as rapidly as possible.

He told us there are six vaccines currently under development. He reminded us that the Federal Government, using taxpayers' money, has helped accelerate this by providing money to manufacture these vaccines before they are deemed safe and effective and that he does not necessarily expect all of the vaccines to work. And if they don't work or if they are not safe, they will be thrown in the dumpster. They will not be distributed to anyone to use.

He pointed out that AstraZeneca announced today that 1 person in its clinical trial—which probably has 30,000 people in the UK—had developed an illness and they had paused the trial. In other words, they stopped giving shots to the volunteers in the clinical trial until they could see whether the illness is related to the vaccine.

Some people believe that Operation Warp Speed means cutting corners, but it does not. It refers to the extraordinary investment in research, development, and manufacturing scale-up for the COVID-19 vaccine.

Perhaps most significantly, the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority—we call it BARDA—has taken the unprecedented step, as I mentioned earlier, to speed up manufacturing for hundreds of millions of doses early in the process by buying those doses in advance so they can be ready to distribute as soon as the vaccines are approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

Several of our Senators on both sides of the aisle asked Dr. Collins and Dr. Adams, the Surgeon General, whether they intended to let politics play a role in the decision about whether a vaccine is safe and effective and ready for distribution. They answered absolutely no, that they would be no part of such a decision.

The same has been said by Dr. Stephen Hahn, who is the Commissioner of the FDA charged with making that judgement. "This is going to be a science, medicine, data decision," he said. It "is not going to be a political decision." That means if it is not safe, it will not be distributed.

At the same time, the Centers for Disease Control is working on a plan to distribute the vaccine as soon as they are authorized or approved, prioritizing vaccines for healthcare workers and vulnerable populations. The CDC says its plan will be a fair system informed by nonpartisan health experts from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and others.

Some have suggested—of course, this is a political season; we have an election in 2 months—that the reason we are rushing, as a government, to create the vaccine is so it will help President Trump before the election in November, or that the reason the Centers for Disease Control said to the States: Get ready now to distribute the vaccine when it is effective and safe—that that is a political move.

Of course, I said that if Dr. Collins and Dr. Adams had come in and said it would be 5 years before we had a vaccine, we would probably ask the President to fire them, because people are dying, and we need vaccines. We don't want the alternative, which is to run the disease through millions of Americans until everybody either dies or is infected and recovers, and we don't want to have happen again what happened before with the H1N1 virus, where the vaccine was ready, but the States weren't ready to distribute it. So we were pleased to see what the response was.

Americans are saying that they might not take the vaccine. The first question people ask is, Are they safe? They are safe because they are reviewed by the FDA, which is the gold standard for safety. Vaccines are routinely given to children. They are specifically recommended by an advisory commission that looks at it carefully, consisting of doctors and physicians and scientists.

In a 2015 article for the *Scientific American*, a distinguished scientist wrote:

By age two, most children will receive almost 30 shots designed to boost a child's natural defenses against disease. Yet at the same time, parents who take their children for those recommended vaccinations might be inundated with Web site and celebrity-espoused rumors making false claims that shots are not necessary or cause autism.

This distinguished scientist wrote:

At best, navigating this landscape can be confusing. But when weighing the risks of encountering life-threatening disease against the benefits of receiving a vaccine there's no contest. The vast majority of children do not experience anything worse than short-lived redness or itching at the spot of the injection.

I asked Dr. Collins this question, which I think is confusing to some people: When you take the COVID vaccine, you don't get COVID? There was a time in the old days when to get a smallpox vaccine, you, in fact, got a little smallpox. But that is not what happens. As Dr. Collins explained it, he said the vaccine creates a sort of machine within your body and your immune system to fight the COVID. It doesn't infect you with the disease.

Then there is the question about whether the vaccines are effective. I talked about how polio is now eradicated. The number of polio cases since the vaccines has fallen rapidly to less than 100 in the 1960s and less than 10 in the 1970s thanks to the successful vaccination program. According to the Centers for Disease Control, the United States has been polio-free since 1979. Diphtheria was a terrifying prospect for parents in the 1920s, but according to the scientific agencies and the government, there are only a few of those a year.

Then there is the concern about whether the doctor's office is safe. I have heard that from people, but the studies have shown that the pediatricians—and we heard that testimony today—have made great efforts to try to make their offices the safest places that a parent can go with their child in order to get a vaccination.

Finally, I started my comments this morning with comments from Jared Diamond, and I concluded with a warning he wrote for the *Wall Street Journal*. He said in effect that the main thing that is different about this disease, COVID-19, is not that it is more infectious; the main thing that is different is the jet plane—the plane that can carry people all over the world, all over our country, spreading whatever the infection is. He said that as a result of that, the next pandemic could be next year.

That is why I have introduced in the Senate legislation that would help prepare for the next pandemic. It has support on all sides. Senator Frist from Tennessee, the former majority leader; Senator Daschle, the former majority leader on the Democratic side; many experts—all say we have a problem in this country going from panic to neglect to panic. While we have taken some important steps, as Senator BARR pointed out today, to create the authority for the government to build manufacturing plants, to manage stockpiles better, to be prepared for pandemics, as soon as the epidemic is over, we move on to something else. So the time to deal with the next pandemic is now.

There is specific legislation to make sure that we sustain funding for on-shore manufacturing so we are not relying on China, India, and other countries to make our vaccines for the next pandemic. There is money to make sure that the stockpiles are filled with protective equipment so we don't have the kinds of delays that some people experienced in this pandemic.

Former Governor Mike Leavitt said to our committee that we have underfunded public health for the last 30 to 40 years, and when we underfund public health and the next pandemic comes, we are not as ready for it as we should be.

Fortunately, thanks to an unprecedented effort by scientists around the world, preparation by Republican and Democratic administrations over the

last 20 years and several Congresses, we have done a lot to be well prepared for this pandemic, and we are moving more rapidly than we ever have to create new diagnostic tests, new treatments, and new vaccines. Some of the challenges that remain are how to distribute them, to whom they should go first, and how to persuade Americans they are safe to take.

But while we are in the midst of dealing with all of this, it would be wise to remember that any legislation that we pass in Congress this year dealing with this pandemic should also take steps to make sure that our stockpiles are filled, that our manufacturing plants can stay functioning, and that public health State by State is well funded, because, as Jared Diamond said, the reason to do that now, while our eye is on the ball, is because the next pandemic could be next year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

(The remarks of Mr. HAWLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 4543 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HAWLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CRAMER). The Democratic leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 685

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am proud to support the resolution by the Senator from Illinois, and we will hear from her shortly. I very much appreciate her work.

Now, in his famous letter to Lydia Bixby, mother of five sons who all died in the Civil War, President Lincoln prayed that our Heavenly Father would assuage her grief, noting the "solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of Freedom."

According to a recent report in the Atlantic, President Trump complained about visiting a World War I military cemetery in France because Americans who died there were "suckers" and "losers."

Over the past 4 years, President Trump has achieved some remarkable lows in the annals of Presidential conduct and character, but every so often we are jolted by the sheer depravity of his comments. This President's insults about our fallen servicemembers and the nature of military service in general fall into that category—the lowest of the low.

There is no greater sacrifice an American can make than to lay down their life for our country, no greater sorrow than the sorrow felt by parents who bury their children wrapped in the American flag. Everyone who has the privilege of working in public office knows this deep truth in their bones but not the current President of the United States; not President Trump; not this man who dodged the Vietnam war with bone spurs; not this man who insulted Gold Star families, who looked at our former colleague John

McCain, a man who was tortured in a POW camp for 5 years, and said, "I prefer people who weren't captured"; not this President, who doesn't understand one iota of the word "sacrifice" and cannot even comprehend why someone might give themselves for a larger cause.

According to these reports, when President Trump went to Arlington National Cemetery, which included a visit to the grave of General Kelly's son, he turned to him and said: I don't get it. What was in it for them?

Everyone—everyone—ought to be appalled. What the Commander in Chief says about our servicemembers and our veterans matters a great deal. It affects the morale of our military, our standing on the world stage, and it reveals the character of the man who has to make life-and-death decisions involving our Armed Forces.

We have heard the President and his team try to deny that the President ever made those comments. I mean, come on. The President is on video saying nearly the same thing, out loud, on several occasions—about one of our former colleagues, no less.

In a short time, Senator DUCKWORTH will ask this Chamber to condemn the President's remarks and reaffirm our Nation's steadfast and unwavering commitment to the individuals serving in the U.S. armed services. I want to thank the Senator from Illinois for leading this resolution. More importantly, I want to thank her for her service, both to the people of Illinois and to our country, as an Army aviation officer.

I hope, I pray, I plead with our Republican friends not to block this resolution. I am already disappointed at how few of them have spoken out to criticize President Trump for his remarks. Are they really so afraid to say anything against this President that they would give him a pass when he disparages our own military? Will they really block a resolution condemning the unequivocally disgusting comments, a resolution that reaffirms our support for the military?

I certainly hope not. If you can't stand up and say the President was wrong to say these things, then what can you criticize this President or any President for? When comments like this are made about the sacrifices of our Armed Forces, every single elected official should understand instinctively that they are wrong, especially—especially—when they come from the Commander in Chief. Let's have the entire Senate—Democrats and Republicans—stand together and say so with this resolution.

I yield to my colleague from Illinois. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I come to the floor today as a Senator, a veteran, and apparently, according to Donald Trump, a "sucker" and a "loser." Perhaps my presence here is uncomfortable for him. After all, ac-

cording to a number of reports, he thinks nobody wants to see wounded warriors like me who have lost limbs fighting to keep other Americans safe.

Unfortunately for him, I am here, and I am here because the ethos of the U.S. military is the exact opposite of the selfish, craven, "me first" mentality that Trump has shown every hour of every day of his life.

In the Army, part of our soldiers' creed was to never leave a fallen comrade behind, and the only reason I am speaking today, the only reason I am breathing today—alive today—is that, on November 12, 2004, after Iraqi insurgents fired an RPG through the Black Hawk I was copiloting, my buddies embodied that creed.

They thought I was dead, yet they risked their own safety to bring my body back home to my family, only realizing I was still breathing when they got me to the rescue aircraft. Then these heroes, wounded themselves, refused care until the medic attended to me first.

If it had been Donald Trump in that dusty field with me, or in any other battlefield, our wounded like me would have never made it home at all. But he never would have been in Iraq that day because Trump fundamentally cannot understand the notion of sacrificing for your Nation. He can't comprehend the true meaning of courage, the idea of fighting for something greater than yourself, greater than your bank account or your poll numbers.

He doesn't understand service, so he doesn't understand America's servicemembers, the heroes—most of them anonymous to all but those who love them, who have allowed him to sleep soundly in his gold-plated Fifth Avenue Tower throughout his privileged, gilded life. Instead, Trump has reportedly called those who have died or have been wounded in battle "suckers" and "losers," while just today it was reported that he used the most demeaning of terms to refer to the military leaders he thinks of as his generals, echoing comments he has made publicly time after time when he slandered war heroes like John McCain and Gold Star families like the Khans, acting, yet again, as if bleeding to defend your Nation is something to be ashamed of rather than a badge of honor, too ignorant to understand that he is the one who should be ashamed.

I spent this weekend reflecting on the words of another Republican President, who in the midst of crisis reminded those sitting before him at Gettysburg the duty our Nation has to those killed serving our country. In that address we all know so well, he declared that it is for us, the living, to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced; that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion.

That cause was a new birth of freedom in this Nation, the bettering of our democracy, bringing our Union

closer to perfection, even though we know we can never achieve it.

What Lincoln understood—and what Trump never will—is that to be contemptuous of American warriors is to be disrespectful to the whole of the American people. When those lucky enough to serve in Congress—or in the White House—raise our right hands and swear to faithfully serve this Nation in these ornate hallowed halls, it is on us to keep faith with those who have raised their right hands and sworn to serve this Nation in the most dangerous war zones imaginable.

There is an implicit contract between our country's leaders and our warriors: They and their families have entrusted us with their care, their training, and the decision to send them to war. That responsibility is a grave one. They will march to do our bidding on command. They will cross the line of departure and begin killing the enemy at our behest, with no regard for their personal safety or the toll on their mental health.

If our leaders regard our heroes as “suckers” and “losers,” what damage will be done to America's sons and daughters who comprise the terrible swift sword? I can tell you right now, it endangers every single one of them, and it endangers our Nation's safety.

If you care about nothing else, if you care nothing about basic decency or troop morale, it is bad for troop readiness as well. When a warrior goes into combat, they need to know that their buddies to their left and their right will follow that creed to never leave a fallen comrade behind; that no matter what, no matter how, their buddies, their Nation, will get them out of there, even if it is just bringing their body home to rest at Arlington.

It is because our servicemembers uphold the values of the military—in the Army, those are loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, integrity and personal courage—that they are willing to sacrifice everything for this country and that we have the greatest fighting force on the face of the Earth.

Donald Trump, by contrast, has shown active disdain for each of those values in his 4 years in office. He has shown the exact opposite of every one of those traits, displaying no sense of duty, a laughable sense of loyalty, integrity and courage—no, not to be seen. He has no respect for those in uniform, and selfishness is his trademark rather than the selflessness of our troops.

But if Trump's toxicity starts to break down those values within the military, if we start to question why we care about those who have been wounded or killed for us, if we start leaving folks behind, then people will begin to think twice about signing up to serve. Families will reconsider supporting their loved ones' decisions to enlist.

Those few, few Americans who were ready to take on that mission—that burden—will start to hesitate because

they will not know if their own crew will risk their lives like mine did to carry their limp body back to safety, but this coward-in-chief in the White House today is too ignorant in matters of both common decency and national security to get that. He doesn't deserve to be Commander in Chief of this military for another 4 minutes, let alone another 4 years.

So, yes, I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues will be objecting to passing my Senate resolution honoring our troops, veterans, and Gold Star families and that they will not be condemning Trump's disgraceful behavior that denigrates military service that has dishonored the office of the Presidency.

Does any Senator actually oppose affirming the part of what makes America not only great but good is the service of Americans who have always placed the mission first, never asking what is in it for them? Does any Member actually object to the Senate resolving to always respect the sacrifices and bravery of those who became prisoners of war or went missing in action?

I am confident that no one here actually opposes the Senate declaring that we will always care for service-disabled veterans who have borne the battle in defense of our Nation, recognizing that wounds of war are earned by patriots who put America's interests before their own.

So what is the problem? If Senate Republicans actually agree with everything I just listed, why would they oppose my resolution stating the same? I know some may dismiss the resolution out of hand, claiming it is nothing more than just a partisan jab at Donald Trump. To those people, I would simply ask that they not rewrite recent history and stop pretending that outrage over Trump's disrespect of the military is something new or one that just originated with the Democrat Party. After all, some of the very first public officials to speak out against it were Republican Senators who continue to serve in this very Chamber today.

When then-Candidate Trump claimed the late Senator John McCain was not a war hero because Trump “like[s] people who weren't captured,” it was the Senator's friend from South Carolina who wrote: “If there was ever any doubt that [Trump] should not be our commander in chief, [this] should end all doubt.” Again, it was the senior Senator from Florida who said much of the same.

I can only say that it is shameful that no one on the other side of the aisle has stood up to condemn this President for the comments he has made, for the fact that he did not make his way to that cemetery to honor those veterans of Belleau Wood laying at rest in that foreign soil, who were there not just for us but for our allies, for everyone that they may never even know.

Today, I am here to ask, as if in legislative session, unanimous consent

that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 685, which was submitted earlier today. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Thank you, Senator DUCKWORTH, for your service and your sacrifice. We share the goal of supporting our military and our veterans. However, the left's latest outrage against President Trump is, as usual, baseless. Here is the truth: The Atlantic article is just one in a long line of lies and political attacks against President Trump by unaccountable, fake news outlets and the so-called anonymous sources.

Here is another truth, one that will not be covered by the fake news: No one has done more to support our men and women in uniform, including our veterans, and more to restore peace and prosperity for all Americans than President Donald J. Trump.

Let me share the facts with some of my colleagues and the media, which they refuse to acknowledge. This President has championed a historic investment of \$2.2 trillion into our military, a 3 percent pay raise for troops—the largest in a decade. He has personally thanked our troops on the ground in Iraq, Afghanistan, South Korea, and Germany. He has spent countless hours honoring our wounded warriors at Walter Reed Medical Center and honoring our fallen servicemembers killed in action at Dover Air Force Base.

He confirmed plans to withdraw troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, honoring his commitment to end endless wars. Finally, today, he was nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize for his leadership in facilitating the Israel-UAE peace deal, a historic step toward a safer world for all. I am proud to defend President Trump against another desperate political attack. I proudly stand with him in support of our military and our veterans.

This Atlantic hit piece is the antithesis of honest journalism. More than two dozen former and current administration officials have rebutted these false claims on the record. In fact, the liberal activist author, who has a history of using sources that are shaky at best, admitted that his reliance on anonymous sources was not good enough. What is not good enough is the media's treatment of this President and his clear track record of support of our military and their families.

Last week, I was at Fort Gordon and Fort Stewart in Georgia, visiting our Active-Duty members. I saw firsthand the opportunities our military leaders

now have to grow our safety and security on all fronts, from combating terrorism to making sure our cyber domain is safer. There was a renewed sense of optimism that should bring all Americans comfort. This is a direct result of the President's work that he is doing every single day for our men and women in uniform. They are fighting every single day to protect us, and he is fighting every single day to have their back.

Here is the truth: President Trump has delivered on his promises to rebuild our military, to respect our veterans, and to keep our country safe. It is time to stop playing politics with our national security and those who provide it.

For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, all I can do is to implore my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reassert their independence, actually put principle before party and support this resolution, which simply recognizes a basic reality. Trump's denigration of military service is even more disgraceful today than it was 5 years ago, as he is now at least supposed to be our troops' Commander in Chief.

Former chief of staff of the Army General Weyand once wrote that the American Army really is the people's Army in the sense that it belongs to the American people. When the Army is committed, the American people are committed.

The Army is not so much an arm of the executive branch as it is an arm of the American people. He may have been talking about the Army, but the sentiment holds true for every military branch, every one of which belongs to the American people. It is made up of their sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, all of whom have dedicated their lives to serve in the Nation they love on behalf of the people they love. When Donald Trump mocks our troops, he is mocking every American in every part of this country. When he derides wounded warriors, he is just providing further proof that to him the word "sacrifice" is so foreign it might as well be in another language.

When he makes fun of those who have fallen in battle, he reveals not only his ignorance of national security but his own personal cowardice and insecurities as well. To him, service will never mean anything other than someone else serving him.

Trump may not want to see me here today. He may not like to see visible proof of my war wounds, but he will keep seeing me here because it is my duty to honor the heroes who saved me by using my second chance, using every extra minute, every extra moment that I have to look out for our troops and veterans from here in the Capitol.

I will take advantage of every extra breath I get to breathe because, unlike Donald Trump, our men and women in uniform know what courage, sacrifice, and service truly mean.

With that, I note how grateful I am for my Democratic colleagues who are here with me today to show support for our troops, veterans, and Gold Star families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Mr. President, instead of passing a resolution meant to politicize our military, I am offering my own resolution to honor the service and the sacrifice of the members of the U.S. Armed Forces, veterans, prisoners of war, and Gold Star families.

My resolution also recognizes President Trump's strong record of supporting our troops, taking care of our veterans, defending the American people from foreign threats. President Trump and I have and always will honor the service and sacrifice of our brave men and women in uniform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as if in legislative session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of my resolution at the desk. I further ask 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. Is there objection?

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I cannot support the incomplete Senate Republican resolution for a simple reason: We are not honoring the service and sacrifice of members of the U.S. Armed Forces, veterans, and Gold Star families in this Republican resolution. We cannot do that if we stay silent and meek when confronted with President Trump's disgraceful denigration of military service, prisoners of war, and military families continue.

We can't control the offensive comments and actions of the President, but the Senate can make a clear statement that our Chamber rejects such disgraceful sentiments.

Republicans' refusal to criticize President Trump speaks volumes when you remember that the outrage over Donald Trump's disrespect of our military is not a new concern. It actually originates with Republican Senators who were among the very first public officials to speak out against his denigration of military service and prisoners of war. I remind you that the senior Senator from Florida spared no outrage when, in responding to Candidate Trump's claim that Senator McCain was not a war hero, he stated: "It's not just absurd, it's offensive. It's ridiculous. And I do think it's a disqualifier as Commander in Chief."

The Republican resolution is incomplete if it does not condemn this Presi-

dent's comments denigrating our troops. That is why I am disappointed that Republicans won't join me in passing my resolution that recognizes the sad truth that Donald Trump never changed and his denigration of military service and sacrifice is as disqualifying today as it was years ago.

I yield to the senior Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset how proud I am to serve with my colleague, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH of Illinois. Her sacrifice for America is nothing short of amazing. Her life's story, her commitment to the men and women in uniform whom she served with and to the veterans and others, is now well established, not just in my State but across this Nation.

Only a small minority of Americans have had the privilege and honor of serving in the military. Many, like myself, count themselves as those who respect the military and understand that they deserve that respect for their willingness to volunteer to serve and even to die for this Nation. What Senator DUCKWORTH has done with her life is a clear indication of the spirit of the fighting women and men who keep this Nation democratic and safe.

I am really disappointed. What a great moment it would have been in the history of the Senate if we had Republican support, as well as Democratic support, for the Duckworth resolution. I am sorry the Senator from Georgia objected. She took exception to The Atlantic magazine article, the one that said the President called those who died in war "losers" and "suckers," but even that article has been accepted by FOX News as being a valid comment made by the President and reported.

Even if you take The Atlantic magazine and set it aside, there is ample evidence of this President's attitude toward our military. We all heard Donald Trump say publicly, when he was running for President in 2015, about our friend and colleague, the late John McCain: "He's not a war hero. . . . I like people who weren't captured." John McCain spent more than 5 years in a prisoner-of-war camp in Vietnam, and this President, Donald Trump, dismisses him as no war hero. John McCain suffered for his Nation. He deserves the respect of everyone, let alone the President.

We also saw Donald Trump publicly attack a Gold Star family in 2016, the parents of the late Humayun Khan, an Army captain killed in Iraq in 2004.

We have heard President Trump dismiss traumatic brain injury faced by servicemembers and veterans as just "headaches."

We have seen his silence in the face of reports that Russia offered bounties to kill American servicemembers in Afghanistan.

We have witnessed his use of military officials for photo ops or as his own personal security forces.

Recall the scene in "A Very Stable Genius" by Washington Post reporters Philip Rucker and Carol Leonnig in which Trump called the service chiefs "a bunch of dopes and babies" and barked: "You're all losers. You don't know how to win anymore." President Trump repeated those claims again in a news conference just this week.

These are just a few examples of not fake news but real news about this President's attitude toward the American fighting men and women. It is no surprise that he would say vile things privately if he would say these things publicly.

Instead of respecting our troops, President Trump ridicules them. Instead of bowing his head in humility, he barks insults and obscenities. No President in our history—none that I can even imagine—has been so juvenile, so abusive, and so cynical in speaking of our fallen heroes. What do we hear from Republican officeholders about these sickening comments? Very little, if anything, in objection. Their silence is deafening.

I want to close by thanking my colleague, Senator DUCKWORTH, for bringing this matter to the floor of the Senate. Every Member of the Senate—man, woman, Democrat, Republican—we all carry the flag and proudly march in parades and give those inspirational speeches on Memorial Day about the men and women who have served our Nation, but where are the voices in the Senate today to speak out against the outrages of this President?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am honored to join Senator DUCKWORTH in supporting this proposal. It gives me great pride to serve in the Senate with her. She is the living embodiment of the kind of sacrifice that our President does not understand.

There are two things here, though, that are very wrong. One is a President who thinks that the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who have laid down their lives for this country are "suckers" and "losers" and that it is OK to say that about them. It is beyond disrespectful. It is beneath contempt, and it is totally in character for this man. Those soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines can't answer; they can't speak for themselves any longer. So when something like that is said, it is very important that people in the highest offices of the country stand up and push back.

In graves in France and Belgium and Manila and around the world lie the mortal remains of men, boys, women who gave their lives and who cannot speak for themselves. It is heart-breaking for me to see that we cannot come together to agree on that in this body.

I can promise you that if President Obama or President Clinton had said anything like this, the other side of this Chamber would have been in pandemonium. It would have been a scene of hysteria. Senators would have been lining up through the doors to come and condemn this foul and hateful speech. We would have been hearing a lot about the last full measure of devotion. Instead, we are seeing the last measure of devolution of a great party into what now resembles, as much as anything, a cult.

I will be interested to see what my colleagues have in mind as they go through next year's Veterans Day and Memorial Day having been unable to say one word against this calumny of our troops today. It is, frankly, heart-breaking.

I traveled a lot with John McCain, and one of our trips took us to the Philippines. I got up very early in the morning to go and have basically a dawn visit to the Manila American Cemetery. The particular reason I went there is to see a name on the wall of the memorial: George Bruen Whitehouse. George was 21 when he was killed. He was flying fighter planes as a Navy pilot off an aircraft carrier called the USS *Cowpens*. His body was never recovered. His plane was shot down and crashed into the wilderness, and that was the end of it, but his name is still there, carved high up in the marble as a last memorial of his sacrifice. A President who doesn't get that is a disgrace.

I yield the floor.

Particularly, I yield the floor to a colleague who is an American combat veteran from the Vietnam war, to which my father dedicated 5 years of his life. It is a remarkable honor for me to be able to speak in between Senator DUCKWORTH and Senator CARPER. I am cognizant of that honor.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CARPER. It is an honor to follow my friend Senator WHITEHOUSE.

You could only turn out well, my friend, with the bloodlines you have.

Mr. President, I rise today really for one reason: I rise today to make crystal clear that we are profoundly grateful to every American who has answered our Nation's call to serve in uniform, to risk their lives, and in too many instances to lay down their lives so that we might remain a free people.

We are profoundly grateful to their families who have sacrificed so much while their loved ones were away fighting to protect the rest of us and making this a better and more just world.

We are especially indebted to those families whose loved ones left for war and never came home. It is a sacrifice that many Americans can barely imagine but one that has been all too real for millions of families since the founding of our Nation.

One of those families was my mother's family. I never got to meet my mom's younger brother. His name was Bob Kidd Patton. My mom was a Pat-

ton. Bob was the youngest of five children, born near the coal-mining town of Beckley, WV, to my grandparents, Ray and Effie Mae Patton, a Gold Star mother. Bobby was killed in action on October 26, 1944, during a kamikaze attack in the Western Pacific on his aircraft carrier, the USS *Suwannee*. Among the bodies of the ship's crew who were never recovered was that of my Uncle Bob. On the day of that attack, he was—get this—19 years, 6 months, 23 days old. My grandparents were never able to see their son again or say goodbye. My sister and I, along with our cousins, would never meet him.

Neither Bob Patton nor his *Suwannee* shipmates who also perished that day were "suckers" or "losers," as President Trump has characterized others who answered our Nation's call to uniform; they were and remain heroes.

I was fortunate enough to make it home after serving three tours in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam war, but 58,000 of my brothers and sisters never did. Their names are inscribed in a black granite wall not far from here so Americans will remember their sacrifice. Let me add that those 58,000 Americans were not "suckers" or "losers" either, as President Trump has described John McCain; they were patriots. Unlike Donald Trump, they answered the call of duty.

My squadron and I were deployed to Southeast Asia as part of the Seventh Fleet for several of the years that John McCain was held as prisoner of war in the "Hanoi Hilton," along with hundreds of other POWs. His plane had been shot down in 1967 over Hanoi. Both his arms and one of his legs were broken during the ensuing crash, and he was taken prisoner of war. For 5½ years, John McCain was held captive, beaten, and tortured. Despite this, he refused the early release that was offered to him by his captors. Far from being the loser that President Trump refers to him as, John McCain was the embodiment of courage, and my colleagues know it. He proved that again and again in uniform and right here in this Chamber, standing right over there.

A number of us in this body have been blessed to serve alongside other true patriots both during our time in Congress and in uniform.

The late Dan Inouye lost an arm and earned the Medal of Honor while serving in the 442nd—the most decorated American Army unit of World War II. They were all Japanese Americans who were despised by many Americans. They were heroes too.

There is former Senator Bob Dole—another highly decorated World War II hero who was nearly paralyzed and lost the use of one arm after he had been hit by enemy fire while he helped to save the life of a fellow soldier.

Then there is, of course, our amazing friend and our amazing colleague, TAMMY DUCKWORTH. God love her.

TAMMY, thank you for bringing us to the floor today.

For any American to disparage heroes like them who gave their lives or limbs for a country would be despicable, but to hear that contempt from the man who is now our Commander in Chief and who chose not to serve in the Vietnam war because of, allegedly, bone spurs in his foot is worse than despicable—it is abhorrent.

What is most surprising and really disappointing to me, though, is not that Donald Trump would use words like “loser” and “sucker” to describe heroes like John McCain and others. What is most surprising and disappointing is that there are only Democrats on this floor today who are condemning the utter contempt that Donald Trump has shown for our servicemembers over too many years. There should be 100 Senators on this floor today—100—saying, in no uncertain terms, that we have nothing but respect and admiration for those who have served and that we will not allow them to be mocked or ridiculed by anyone, including by the President of the United States.

Honoring those who have served this country and risked their lives for this country is among the most sacred of obligations any of us has. If we can't stand up and defend those men and women, then we have no business being here.

Let me close with this.

To the millions of soldiers, sailors, air men and women, marines, and Coast Guard members who are risking their lives right now around the world and who have done so for generations, listen to this: We salute you. We thank you. We thank your families from the bottom of our hearts. God bless you. Stay safe. Come home.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, as I listen to my colleagues, I am honored every day to serve with them in the U.S. Senate.

In 2018, in Minden, NV, I had the honor of commemorating the opening of the Moving Wall, which is a replica of the Vietnam war memorial that travels the country so the public can pay its respects to Vietnam veterans. I will always remember the stories that veterans and their families shared with me that day—stories of coming home from a divisive war to an equally divided public. The pain of that reception was still fresh for many of them decades later.

America's servicemembers make an implicit pact with our country. They agree to put their lives on the line, and in exchange, they deserve our support, our care for them and their families, and our respect.

Last week, The Atlantic magazine published a story in which anonymous sources claimed that Donald Trump doesn't demonstrate that respect. The article described a Commander in Chief who calls his own country's fallen soldiers “losers” and “suckers.” The story

has fit a pattern from other anonymous sources over the years, some having described the President as lashing out at generals and calling them “dopes” and “babies.”

Now, granted, these are from anonymous sources, so let's set them aside for just a moment. As the saying goes, journalism is the rough draft of history, and sometimes that rough draft gets things wrong.

What do we know?

What we do know from the President's public statements is that Donald Trump does not understand the sacrifice and heroism that America's Armed Forces demonstrate on a daily basis, and that makes him unfit to lead them. How can a Commander in Chief make life and death decisions for our troops when he doesn't understand the very nature of the sacrifice he is asking?

I am not making up Donald Trump's refusal to understand military sacrifice. You just have to look at the record, and you have heard some of it today. That record is part of the public record that, in 1968, showed that Donald Trump avoided military service through a medical deferment. Although Donald Trump did not serve in the military, he has felt free to criticize others who have and their families.

In 2015, we heard then-Candidate Donald Trump say that John McCain was “not a war hero. . . . I like people who weren't captured.” He was talking about a man who endured torture during the 5 years he spent as a prisoner, a man who upheld the highest standards of our military by turning down the release that his captors offered him in order to stay with his fellow POWs, a man who refused to denounce his country even when his captors informed him it could earn him his freedom.

Clearly, this President has no conception of that integrity and that sacrifice. A President who refuses to honor men and women who were captured doesn't understand what heroism is.

In 2016, as the Republican nominee for President, Donald Trump attacked the family of CPT Humayan Khan, who was killed in Iraq while trying to stop a suicide bomber. For his brave and self-sacrificing actions that day, Captain Khan received a Bronze Star and a Purple Heart.

Accompanied by his wife at the Democratic National Convention, Mr. Khan spoke about his son's sacrifice. In response, after seeing Mr. Khan and his wife, Donald Trump said:

If you look at his wife, she was standing there. She had nothing to say. She probably—maybe she wasn't allowed to have anything to say.

Can you imagine criticizing a mother for not being able to articulate the pain of losing her son? A President who mocks a military family's pain doesn't understand what selflessness is.

Just this Monday, we heard Donald Trump say that the top people in the

Pentagon want to do nothing but fight wars so that all of those wonderful companies that make the bombs stay happy.

A President who attacks America's generals as valuing profits over the men and women they command doesn't understand what leadership is, and because, even after 3 years as Commander in Chief Donald Trump can't understand or appreciate the commitment and sacrifice of America's servicemembers, he cannot effectively lead them.

At the end of the day, Donald Trump does not understand the very purpose of our military. He seems to believe that the military is his personal police force. He doesn't get that the allegiance to which our Armed Forces swear is to the American Nation, its people, and its Constitution.

We saw this when, in June, President Trump threatened to use the Insurrection Act to send Active-Duty troops to police the streets of this country. I was in Washington on the day this administration ordered police on horseback, armed with tear gas and concussion grenades, to disperse protesters who were peacefully protesting against police violence—all so that Donald Trump could stage a photo opportunity in front of a church while he held a Bible. On that same night, I could hear the noise overhead from the National Guard Black Hawk helicopters that engaged in a show-of-force display on the streets of Washington.

I come from a family of servicemembers. My father was stationed in Korea after the war. My grandfathers both served in the U.S. Army, and I had a great uncle who was on the beach at Normandy. My father-in-law piloted LCM-3s in Korea for the Army, and I keep on the shelf in my Senate office a photo that he took of the Korean War Veterans Memorial, here in Washington, in winter. That stark image of troops in the snow, moving cautiously through danger, is a reminder to me of the humanity and sacrifice of our servicemembers, including of my father and father-in-law.

Each year, when I celebrate the induction of new Nevadans to the service academies, I see the next generation devoting its idealism and its courage to our country, and I consider the weighty sacrifice of people who are so very young.

After reading the stories in the news and reflecting on the history of comments from our current Commander in Chief, I just want to say one simple thing to veterans, servicemembers, and their families in Nevada and throughout this country: Thank you. I will always stand with American troops who put their lives and bodies on the line to protect our country, and the American people deserve a Commander in Chief who will do the same.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am proud to follow my colleagues who

have spoken on the floor, particularly Senators CARPER and DUCKWORTH, and to join them today, for they are in the great tradition of this body—Bob Dole, Daniel Inouye, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, TOM CARPER, and John McCain. We have known our share of heroes, and I am here to say thank you to them and to the others among us who have served.

I am proud to be here as a dad of two veterans—one a combat infantry officer in the Marine Corps, another a special operator in the Navy. Both are deployed. I myself served in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. I am here to say to the other moms and dads and loved ones that Donald Trump does not speak for me; that Donald Trump does not speak for us; and that Donald Trump does not speak for America.

When he called those brave heroes who laid down their lives “suckers” or “losers,” my first reaction was disbelief. Then, in an instant, it was totally to believe that he had said it because it was so much in character for Donald Trump. For him, it is all about Donald Trump. If somebody else can serve and take his place without there being sacrifice on his part, so much the better. Donald Trump does not speak for the America I know and love or for those who have given of themselves or risked their lives, like my colleagues who have spoken today.

When Donald Trump talked about the heroes of Belleau Wood, he could have used a history lesson because, clearly, the marines at Belleau Wood were not suckers. In fact, the relentless tenacity of their fighting earned them a nickname from the German soldiers who were their adversaries. The Germans called them “Teufelshunde,” meaning “devil dog.” This proud moniker has stuck with them all of these years, and they use it when addressing each other—“devil dog.” That is what they were.

One of their commanding officers, Maj. Thomas Holcomb, wrote a letter to his wife 2 days into battle, which reads:

The regiment has carried itself with undying glory, but the price was heavy. . . . There never was such self-sacrifice, courage, and spirit shown.

In the 3 weeks of fighting, the 4th Marine Expeditionary Brigade suffered a 55-percent casualty rate—55 percent. His battalion alone suffered 764 casualties out of 900 men. He became the 17th Commandant of the Marine Corps and Belleau Wood became part of Marine Corps history. That battle was one of hundreds, even thousands of battles, where soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines distinguished themselves with uncommon valor. For every Belleau Wood, there are other battles for each of those services. None of them fought like suckers or losers.

The cost of war is unspeakably high, and we know that from our own work on the Armed Services Committee and on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I had just come from a hearing of the

Veterans' Affairs Committee where we were discussing the problem of veteran suicide. Twenty of our heroes take their own lives every day. Yet we in this body have failed to provide effective solutions to those invisible wounds that caused those deaths. That is a national disgrace.

So, to the loved ones of those who have risked and given their lives, we are here to make a point. This resolution makes that point eloquently and powerfully. Donald Trump speaks for no one in this body, as far as I know, and it is a shame that our Republican colleagues are literally absent. They are absent without leave. They are AWOL from this moment in history that calls upon them to stand up and be heard in the name of our Nation's heroes. Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to express my support for the resolution introduced by my colleagues, Senators DUCKWORTH and REED. I thank both of them, not only for acting swiftly to defend the honor of our servicemen and service-women but for their distinguished service to our country, both of them veterans themselves.

By now, we are used to Donald Trump saying a lot of dishonorable, distasteful, and downright disgusting things, but there truly is no bottom when it come to this President, as is evident in the despicable comments he made about our fallen soldiers as reported last week by The Atlantic, comments that have since been confirmed by additional reporting from FOX News, which is normally very supportive of the President, and the Associated Press. He called these heroes, these fallen soldiers, “suckers” and “losers”—“suckers” and “losers.”

The Atlantic reports that, while traveling in Europe to commemorate the end of World War I back in November of 2018, President Trump canceled a scheduled visit to honor those buried at Aisne-Marne American Cemetery. He didn't understand why he should bother visiting such a cemetery in the first place. “It's filled with losers,” he said. Can you imagine? Can you imagine?

It was on that same trip that President Trump referred to our marines who died in battle at Belleau Wood as “suckers” for getting killed—“suckers” for getting killed—“losers” and “suckers.”

Those words are hurtful words. They are damaging words. They are words that should never be spoken by a Commander in Chief. It is unthinkable, it is unforgivable, and I think it is un-American.

The same story also recounts the President's visit to Arlington Cemetery with then-Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly, himself a Gold Star father, who lost his son Robert in 2010 in Afghanistan. Standing over 1st

Lt. Robert Kelly's grave, the President of the United States turned to his father and said, “I don't get it. What was in it for them?”

“What was in it for them?” This question captures the very essence of what is so deeply wrong with this President. In other words, why would any American give their life in service to our country? Why would anyone do anything if not for fame or fortune?

You see, Donald Trump cannot fathom the idea of serving a cause greater than yourself because Donald Trump only serves himself. He cannot understand why anyone would choose to live a life of service; why anyone would risk it all to carry our flag on the battlefield; why anyone would put their own life on the line to defend our country, our people, and all that we as Americans stand for.

Since these despicable comments came to light, the White House has bent over backwards to deny them. Once again, too many of our Republican colleagues have stood silent, instead of forcefully and unequivocally condemning the President's words. They would rather cower to the cruelty of Donald Trump than stand up to those who have worn the uniform of the United States.

The sad truth is that none of us have to stretch our imaginations to picture President Trump calling our fallen soldiers “suckers” and “losers” because he has repeatedly denigrated our men and women in uniform and the entire concept of military service.

This is a man who, according to a New York Times investigation, had his wealthy father reportedly pay off a doctor in order to get a medical deferment from serving in Vietnam; a man who spoke out against disabled veterans selling goods on ritzy Fifth Avenue in New York City; a man who said that our late colleague, Senator John McCain, whom I was privileged to work with on so many national security issues, was no war hero—he is not someone who should be praised because he was caught, a prisoner of war—and resisted lowering U.S. flags in his honor; a man who has publicly attacked Gold Star families and failed to grasp the weight of their sacrifice; a man who, when asked about America's soldiers injured in the Iranian missile attack last January on Al Asad Airbase in Iraq, shrugged off traumatic brain injuries as nothing more than a mere headache; and, most recently, a man who, as Commander in Chief, has done nothing—absolutely nothing—in response to revelations that the Kremlin was awarding bounties to Taliban terrorists for killing U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan—the Kremlin, Russia, giving Taliban soldiers a bounty—a premium, a prize, a bonus—for killing U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan.

What message does it send to the children of fallen soldiers when they read that the President called their parents “losers” and “suckers”? What message does it send to the young people I will speak with this weekend,

whom I host an academy weekend with, who are considering applying to some of our Nation's most prestigious military academies?

What message does it send to adversaries like Vladimir Putin to learn that the President of the United States thinks that our service men and women on the ground in Afghanistan are suckers for being assassinated by Taliban terrorists?

Article II of the Constitution does not give much instruction when it says that the President shall serve as Commander in Chief; yet somehow, every President, until now, has carried out their responsibilities with a reverence for the men and women who serve our country and a sense of gratitude for those who give their lives in defense of our freedoms.

Let me close with the words of a Gold Star mother from southern New Jersey. Camden County Freeholder Melinda Kane's son, Marine LCpl Jeremy Kane, died in Afghanistan more than a decade ago. She wrote:

I am nauseated to think that the commander in chief of our military would even think to disparage individuals, like my son, who paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to every American. . . . For the parents raising children whose fathers and mothers have given everything to this country, how do they explain President Trump's words? These brave Americans served with honor, integrity and heroism doing the things that civilians could not and would not do. That said, here we are today, in a place we never thought we would be—ensuring the world knows that those that serve our country are heroes.

Today, I want to say to our service men and women—from the young recruit who just enlisted, to the soldier patrolling distant lands, to those who wore the uniform, to the loved ones of those who lost a loved one at war—you deserve an apology from our Commander in Chief. Because you are not likely to get one, I think it is important to say it here on the floor of the U.S. Senate: You are not suckers. You are not losers. You are heroes. Your families deserve our admiration and support for their sacrifices. The American people will always value you for bravely bearing our country's cause, even when the President of the United States will not.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I join my colleagues to honor the service and sacrifice of members of the U.S. Armed Forces, veterans, and Gold Star families, and to commemorate the men and women in uniform who made the ultimate sacrifice to protect our Nation.

Since the earliest days of this country, we have been blessed by selfless men and women who have run toward, not away from, mortal danger. Driven by a profound sense of patriotism, they laid down their own lives to defend the freedoms that define our Nation.

That level of courage is difficult to comprehend and impossible to repay. Therefore, we show our gratitude by re-

membering these heroes—their bravery, their strength, and their hope—and also the sacrifices of the loved ones who have lost family members in uniform.

One such hero is SFC John David Randolph Hilty from Bowie, MD. Sergeant Hilty was serving in Iraq in support of Operation Inherent Resolve, helping to defeat ISIL, when he died this past March 30, 2020. This was after completing three previous tours to Afghanistan and earning several awards for his valiant service, including the Bronze Star Medal, Army Commendation Medal, and Joint Service Achievement Medal.

Those who knew Sergeant Hilty remember him as a devoted son, husband, father, a tremendous leader, and a dear friend. I am thankful for Sergeant Hilty's service to our country and so sorry for the loss of such a wonderful member of our community.

We are forever indebted to the brave men and women like Sergeant Hilty who gave their lives to keep the rest of us safe. As President John F. Kennedy once said, "We must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words, but to live by them." All Americans should be reflecting on the values that these men and women defended, and we must redouble our efforts to uphold them.

Values like the freedoms to speak, worship, think, and dissent, values like equality, justice, and tolerance, values like truth and fairness, these are the pillars of the democracy that so many have died to protect. We honor their sacrifices by working together to build and preserve the America they fought to defend and support.

Our citizen soldiers never need to ask what is in it for them. They know they answer life's highest and most honorable calling. We should all remember the sacrifices that so many servicemen and service women have made defending our freedoms. My thoughts and prayers are with all the families in Maryland and across the United States who have lost loved ones protecting our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, in 2015, when I heard then-candidate Donald Trump denigrate the service of my friend, the late Senator John McCain, suggesting that he was a loser and that his status as a POW was somehow cause for shame or embarrassment, I was rock-solid certain that the America I knew and loved would never allow such a man to occupy the office of the President. I was wrong.

The McCain attack began a slow reveal of the unsurprising moral bankruptcy of a man and the surprising willingness of Republican leadership to tolerate that moral void. The reveal reached a new level last week with Jeffrey Goldberg's reporting—significantly verified by other reporters—that President Trump as Commander in Chief still denigrates the service of

military members, calling them "suckers" and "losers."

The Trump campaign protested loudly against the charge, but in the same instant put out a social media message ridiculing Joe Biden as he visited the grave of his son Beau, an Iraq war veteran, after church last Sunday.

As a Member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the father of a U.S. marine, I find President Trump's attack on our military infuriating. In an era when his countrymen were risking their lives in Southeast Asia, the President dodged service with a timely and miraculously short-lived diagnosis of bone spurs. He bragged that his own personal Vietnam was trying to avoid sexually transmitted diseases at home while others were trying to avoid bullets, landmines, and torture in Vietnam. The selfish young man who avoided service and then equated the ultimate sacrifices of others with his sex life has now ascended into the world's most powerful office holding on to those same immature views.

It is not just about the President's words and attitude. Solid intelligence suggests that Russia has paid bounties for the killing of U.S. troops in Afghanistan. The President and his team have spent time trying to deny the news to the American public with ridiculous efforts to pretend that the President was never even briefed about the matter. The President still refuses to acknowledge the gravity of the threat or hold Russia to account, but, of course, he has described Vladimir Putin as "a better leader than Obama" and as a "friend." He must think: Why risk that friendship for suckers?

After watching this President for years, I conclude that the attack on the military is part of a broader hostility to the notion of serving others. The President stifles charities, disrespects Federal employees, denigrates teachers, and undercuts programs like public service loan forgiveness. He treats the office as a personal piggy bank, filling staff positions with family members and cronies, steering business toward his resorts, making his main domestic priority a tax bill that dramatically benefited his own pocketbook. The death, economic depression, deficits and social division that he has caused through his chaos hardly trouble his conscience because he has the satisfaction of knowing that he has used the office to enrich himself.

Is this the exemplar that we want for our country? President Trump may be unique among American Presidents in that no one holds him up as an example for America's children. No parent or teacher or minister or youth mentor who I know tells children to act like him or talk like him or treat people like he does. Even his supporters, professing support for his nominees and tax plan, have an instinctive understanding that he is not an example we would want our young people to emulate.

Of all the critical issues on the ballot for America in November, the most important is the most elemental. Is America a place where the commitment to serving others matters? Are we our brother's keeper? Do we want our young to join the military or enter the Peace Corps or teach in our public schools? Is service just for suckers or is it the essence of American patriotism?

Growing up, I was certain that I knew the answer to that question. I am less certain today, but I am infinitely more determined.

Mr. CARPER. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. KAINE. I yield.

Mr. CARPER. I spoke earlier of my Uncle Bob. I forgot that we had his photo, but this is what he looked like at the age of 19 years 6 months, and this picture was framed and could be seen in the dining room of my grandparents' house until they died. Alongside it was my picture. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. May I ask the Senator from Delaware a question?

Did that young man lose his life in battle?

Mr. CARPER. He was one of a number of sailors on the USS *Suwannee* who was killed in a kamikaze attack, and none of the bodies were ever recovered.

Mr. TESTER. I want to thank the Senator from Delaware.

You know, this isn't the first time—this isn't the first time the President has denigrated our military. It is not the first time and will not be the last time because there is a total lack of appreciation by this President of the people who serve our country in our military.

I don't have to talk about the bone spurs that gave him how many deferments? Five deferments? He found a way to not fight in Vietnam. Thank God his daddy had enough money to allow him to do that.

Then we think back to John McCain, the decorated war hero. Oh, no, no, no, not in President Trump's mind. It didn't matter that he was a prisoner of war. He was no war hero, the President said.

I am going to tell you, everybody in this body knew John McCain. Everybody in this body probably had a scrap with John McCain and everybody in this body had the highest amount of respect for John McCain. He truly was a war hero.

Then there are the veterans who served in Vietnam, which Agent Orange got the best of them. They are now in their seventies, and they are dying because of their exposure to Agent Orange. Let me tell you, the President denied them their benefits—denied them the benefits. If it wasn't for this body and the House, they still wouldn't have those benefits.

Then there is the time that Vladimir Putin put a contract out on our military. Did the President speak up? No, not to his good buddy Vladimir. No, he wouldn't do it.

Then there was the privatization of the VA. It cost Secretary Shokin his job because he said no, and in a bipartisan way we said no. Well, it is time to say no again in a bipartisan way. This President has crossed the line. "Suckers" and "losers" in our military do not belong in the same sentence, especially when you are talking about the "greatest generation" in Europe who gave their lives for this country.

It is time. It is time not for resolutions that are political games, but it is time to tell this President that he has screwed up in a big, big way. If we don't, it will affect this country's future long after he steps down from the Presidency.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I rise in support of my distinguished colleague Senator DUCKWORTH and her resolution to honor our veterans, military servicemembers, and their families.

Senator DUCKWORTH knows more than anyone in this Chamber about what it means to serve and to sacrifice, and I am honored to serve alongside someone who has given so much to our country—and I might add, she got her training in Alabama, down in Fort Rucker, where we have the training for all Army helicopter pilots. So thank you for that, and I hope you enjoyed your time, and we are going to get you back. Senator DUCKWORTH is but just one representative here with her many brothers and sisters in uniform who have worn the uniform throughout.

Many in this body have served, and we heard a lot today about Senator McCain. I think few stand out as a military veteran more than our late colleague John McCain, the Vietnam veteran war hero, someone whom I served with but never, unfortunately, had the chance to meet. He was still a Member of the Senate by the time I got back here in January of 2018. His illness prevented him from coming to the floor. It will always be one of my great regrets that I could not have had at least 1 day on the floor of the U.S. Senate with John McCain.

He was a Vietnam veteran and a war hero, but he dared to speak out against a President. And this President, to this day, almost 2 years after John McCain's death, John McCain is the target of the President's wrath. Two years later, and he still has comments about a war hero.

I will tell you, to stand on the same floor at a moment like this, the same Senate floor where a hero like Senator McCain of Arizona spoke so passionately on behalf of our military and on which Senator DUCKWORTH speaks so passionately about our military and our veterans, it is truly an honor.

Today, the loss of John McCain's voice in this Chamber is magnified by the silence of too many who will not say what needs to be said. Our military families and veterans deserve our full support. They don't deserve insults.

They deserve our support every day, not just when it is politically convenient. It is the duty of this body and every Member of this body to defend those who have sacrificed so much to defend and protect our Nation. It is the obligation of all patriots in this country to do the same. In fact, true patriots would never think to do otherwise. It would never cross our minds as true patriots—it would never cross their mind to launch an insult to our military and our veterans, much less those who gave the ultimate sacrifice. It is what I do today and every day, as a Senator from Alabama, to honor our military—to honor them because I come from a State of heroes: Alabama.

I worked for one of those heroes. He was a military hero who later became a distinguished Member of this body from 1979 to 1997. Howell Heflin distinguished himself as a Marine officer in the brutal fighting of the Pacific theater of World War II, where he was wounded twice, awarded the Purple Heart and the Silver Star for Valor, and retired at the rank of major. I am so honored to be in his seat today where I worked for him as a young staffer so many years ago.

He, too, would rise in this Chamber in support and defense of our military. I know. I was here. I watched him. I saw him over the years. I was with him in every campaign. He was a tireless proponent of a strong military and understood Alabama's tremendous contributions to our Nation's defense, something I try to carry on in his stead.

As Alabama's Senator, Howell Heflin may have been called many things in the heat of politics, but none would have ever called him a sucker or a loser. None would have ever questioned his patriotism. Even though Alabama has a strong private sector supporting our Nation's military, no one would have ever accused him of simply promoting the business of defense contractors with his strong and unwavering support of defense spending to make America safe and secure.

You know, they are the less than 1 percent of Americans who have volunteered to risk their lives, to be away from their families, their loved ones, for weeks and months at a time, to uproot their families every few years and move, to put themselves in dangerous training, in physical and mental strain, and put themselves in harm's way when they are deployed in combat. Yet they ask for so little in return. That, folks, is the definition of selflessness.

While at one time I worked directly for a military hero in this body, today, as a U.S. Senator, I work for thousands of them—tens of thousands across America but, importantly, in the State of Alabama. I say Alabama is a State of heroes because it is true. Our sons and our daughters enlist and serve our Nation in numbers that far exceed our State's population, and I am so proud of that.

In Alabama alone, there are 27,000 men and women who serve either on

Active Duty or in the Guard or Reserve. Alabama is home to 377,000 veterans. That is a lot of folks in a State of my size. Not quite 10 percent of the population are veterans.

The point here is that families in Alabama know what it means to see a loved one raise their hand and stand ready to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country. I have stood witness and nominated our best and our brightest to military academies in the 2 years that I have been here. We have been able to get over 40 of Alabama's best and brightest high school students into our military academies—40. And I watched with pride in how they became members of the military and how their families were so proud of them, not ever dreaming that one day, if they lost their life, the Commander in Chief of the United States might refer to them as a loser. I can assure every American that among the folks I know of, there are no suckers, and there are no losers. What every volunteer from Alabama, enlisted or officer, has in common is a deep and abiding love for our country.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have had the honor to meet some of these folks overseas. I have traveled with my friend and colleague Senator REED. I have met with folks from Alabama. I have felt their pride in the job that they were doing in Afghanistan and Iraq. They feel it deep down because that is the core of a patriot; that is the core of American values.

We owe each of them not just our gratitude but our commitment to serve them as they are serving or have served us. We have a duty to uphold our promises to care for them and their families, to provide good healthcare, to help them get an education and transition to good jobs after service. We have a duty to honor them with action and with humble appreciation. We should have the decency and sense of patriotism not to denigrate their service, especially if you have avoided making such a sacrifice yourself.

Over the past 2 years, I was fortunate to know a little bit better what it really means to serve and to sacrifice while I was working on the elimination of the military widow's tax. I got to know people like Cathy Milford from Mobile, AL, and so many others whose late spouses had served honorably. I was shocked to learn that for decades they had been denied full survivor benefits that their spouses had earned because the Federal Government wanted to save a few extra bucks. That our country could allow such an injustice to occur for nearly four decades is unconscionable, and we set out to change it.

Cathy used to talk about how she came up here every year, and she would say that every time she would argue for the elimination of the tax, it was like digging up her husband from the grave.

Sadie McCormack's husband passed away in a training accident in South

Korea some 3 years ago. She has two kids at Auburn University, including a daughter who is the recent Miss Peanut for the Dothan area, where Fort Rucker is located. Sadie is a Gold Star wife who became a strong advocate of the military widow's tax issue. She had to go back to work teaching school to pay the bills because of that widow's tax.

Lois Thompson of Dothan is the widow of Army CW4 Richard Thompson, who retired after 35 years and 1 day of service. He retired in 1991 and died on March 18, 2013, having suffered from ALS for more than 6 years. He served two tours of duty where he waded into streams contaminated with Agent Orange. Senator TESTER spoke about the denial of benefits to those who have suffered because of their contamination with Agent Orange.

Mrs. Thompson is 85 years old, and she was his caretaker during his extended illness. She said: My husband served two tours in Vietnam, wading in streams of Agent Orange. The war was so unpopular he couldn't wear his uniform home and was spit on upon arrival back to the States. Our soldiers were often not treated right, even these days.

I agree with Mrs. Thompson, and that is coming down from the Commander in Chief. So, let me make this clear. The sacrifice made by these women and men and their families is incalculable, and for far too many years we have failed to do our duty and keep our promise to those heroes. So I am so glad that with a bipartisan effort in this body and in the House—bipartisan, bicameral—we were able to correct that in last year's defense budget.

Unfortunately, I cannot say that I am surprised by reports that the President called Americans who died in the war losers and suckers. It seems to be just the latest in a series of comments he has made that demonstrate a lack of respect for those who serve. That respect goes far beyond simply putting money into our defense and our military. It goes to your patriotism. It goes to your heart. It is easy to put money into something. It is easy to do those kinds of things, especially when you have an Armed Services like we have here in the Senate that works in such a bipartisan fashion. It is a whole different thing to really talk in the privacy of only a few people about what you really believe.

I can't say I am surprised that combat-wounded veterans make him so uncomfortable that he would ban them from military events and parades. They are reminders of his own failure to serve when called upon. I am not surprised, but I am deeply disappointed—deeply disappointed. Our troops deserve a Commander in Chief who understands or, at the very least, appreciates their service.

As of yesterday, 52,143 Americans have been wounded in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Free-

dom, and 6,784 Americans have given their lives for those two missions. Many more have been deployed, often repeatedly, bringing home experiences and memories that are going to impact them for the rest of their lives. Their dedicated families have served alongside them through every step of the way. Few among us—few among us—can truly understand this kind of sacrifice for a cause greater than ourselves. But what we should all be able to understand is that they deserve our respect, our gratitude, and our unwavering efforts to uphold our promises to them and their families.

So, as I conclude, I stand here today and think about those sacrifices, the pain that John McCain lived with, the pain that TAMMY DUCKWORTH lived with, the honor with which he and she and Howell Heflin served and all of those who have served and sacrificed over the years—all those families and all those who serve today—and it is stunning to me that the only sacrifice that we in this Chamber may suffer for our vote today is to suffer the wrath of a President because we stood in support of them and not him. After all they have done—say what needs to be said—we have to support them and not fear a baseless tweet from the President. A baseless tweet is simply not too high a price to pay for doing what is right by our military and our military families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the Senate resolution sponsored by Senator DUCKWORTH, which condemns the denigration by President Trump of our Nation's Armed Forces and veterans. I also want to commend Senator DUCKWORTH for her extraordinary and heroic service as an Army aviator. She inspired all of us with her courage and her sacrifice.

In a September 3 article in *The Atlantic*, Jeffrey Goldberg catalogued a list of disparaging comments President Trump has made about members of the U.S. military and wounded warriors. Such remarks are not unusual for this President, and most are public knowledge. However, we should not become numb to such behavior, so some of the comments bear repeating.

The *Atlantic* article states that the President refused to visit the Aisne-Marne American Cemetery in France, the final resting place of 2,289 Americans who died in battle, ensuring our freedom and the freedom of our allies against the march of totalitarianism, authoritarianism, fascism, and communism over the past century. He refused to visit because he said the cemetery was filled with “suckers and losers.”

Several years ago, in planning a military parade to honor himself, he refused to include wounded war veterans, stating “no one wants to see that.” When he visited the grave of Gen. John Kelly's son who died in Afghanistan at

the age of 29 and is buried in Arlington National Cemetery, he wondered to General Kelly why his son joined the Marines: "What was in it for him?"

When impressed by a presentation by Gen. Joe Dunford, then the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he asked his staff why such a talented person would join the military.

Donald Trump is a man who cannot conceive of service to others before oneself. His view of the world is transactional. The only thing of value to him is money—not ideals or principles or the lives of our fellow Americans. He simply doesn't understand the words of one of his predecessors, President George Herbert Walker Bush, who said:

On this day, we must tell the stories of those who fought and died in freedom's cause. We must tell their stories because those who've lost loved ones need to know that a grateful Nation will always remember. We must tell their stories so that our children and grandchildren will understand what our lives might have been like had it not been for their sacrifice.

Donald Trump does not think deeply about what it means to be in the military; to be deployed in a battle zone, wondering if every day would be your last day; to be a family member waiting anxiously at home; to be a young, healthy person suddenly disabled or a Gold Star family who wakes every day, mourning their lost son or daughter but understanding the great cause they died for. Donald Trump only cares about the next "win" for himself, his fortune, or his popularity.

Donald Trump deferred service in Vietnam five times, including one deferment for a diagnosis of "bone spurs," which is remarkable, given the propensity he has to play golf, given such a debilitating injury. He has said that those who served in Vietnam were "suckers" for not finding a way out, never able to acknowledge that his privilege of birth and race were largely responsible for being able to avoid service in that war.

Furthermore, President Trump, true to his character, has doubled down and denigrated the military service of past Presidents and military officers, including, as has been referred to repeatedly, Senator John McCain, my close colleague on the Armed Services Committee and my chairman.

He referred to Senator McCain as a "loser" when he died and wondered why the Nation should honor him with flags lowered to half-staff. He said he prefers those who were never captured in war. He would prefer those who never served to a man like Senator McCain, who survived over 5 years in a Vietnamese prisoner-of-war camp, who refused to leave his comrades behind when given the chance, and who endured well-chronicled torture and humiliation that made him an inspiration to so many. In fact, one of the most moving moments in my life was to be in the Hanoi Hilton with John McCain and to have Senator McCain talk about the torture, the humiliation, and the degradation that he endured each day

but maintained his courage and his commitment to this Nation.

The President also does not understand the good order and discipline that are the hallmark of a military in a democracy, ensuring that our military men and women remain firmly tethered to our Nation's moral and ethical principles in the most demanding wartime environments. That is why he saw nothing wrong with intervening in the legal process to pardon a servicemember accused of war crimes. That is why he was able to stand on the steps of the White House and make comments intended to drive a wedge between the men and women in uniform—the junior officers who enlisted and their senior leaders—impugning the motives of senior military officers who have dedicated their lives to the service of the country and who have bled, in some cases, for this country.

Never in this Nation's history has a President held the military and those who served in such disdain and disregard—never. His support for the military is hollow. He touts pay raises that were scheduled to happen anyway and congressional increases in defense spending for readiness which he then diverts to build an ill-advised and wasteful wall on the southern border. He falls short in caring for our men and women in uniform and their well-being and lives—and thinks instead of how they might be useful to him to further his own interests and image.

Donald Trump cannot relate to those who serve in the Armed Forces or understand what would motivate them to choose the harder road of a life of service, of discomfort, and the arduous experience to defend this Nation.

While I know that every American, especially those in uniform, listens to the words of the President, it is my fervent hope that our uniformed personnel do not take the President's words on this issue to heart. As a person who has had the privilege to have led paratroopers, I can tell you there is no greater honor to be among those who serve and protect our Nation, who sacrifice every day so that Americans can live in freedom and peace.

As President Theodore Roosevelt famously said:

The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood, who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, and spends himself in a worthy cause; who at best, if he wins, knows the thrills of high achievement, and, if he fails, at least fails daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory or defeat.

I guess President Trump would say "the losers."

Our men and women in uniform, who fight, die, and are wounded for our Nation and its ideals, are in the arena, not President Trump. As all other public servants who are trying to make our country a better place, they—particularly those in uniform—deserve all the credit. A President who is proud that he has always stood on the side-

lines and denigrates them does not deserve much credit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to honor our veterans and servicemembers.

I thank Senator REED for his beautiful remarks and his service, as well as Senator CARPER. I also thank Senator DUCKWORTH, who is leading our efforts today, as she has led for so long.

As I listened to my colleagues, I know that many of them were couching their remarks in the history of people. I literally could imagine John McCain right now walking up and down that aisle, crossing the aisle, coming over, working with people, slapping people on the back. That is how much he loved this place and how much he loved our country.

I remember the silent, courageous fortitude of Danny Inouye, and I remember so many of those whom I crossed paths with, like Senator Dole.

I think the reason we talk about that history is because we know that this argument and this cause is based in history. Our democracy is based in history. The idea that people serve is based in history. They don't serve for themselves. They serve, in the words of Senator McCain, for a cause larger than themselves. That is why I picture those who served before us, just like our soldiers do when they sign up to serve.

The brave men and women who have served in our Armed Forces represent the best among us. Whether you served decades ago or you still wear a uniform today, we owe you a debt of gratitude for your service and sacrifice on behalf of our great Nation.

All servicemembers and veterans have something in common. Wherever they are politically, they have something in common. Regardless of when and where they served, they have something in common—a deep love of our country and a very real understanding of what it means to serve and sacrifice. They deserve a Commander-in-Chief who loves our country in the same way and for the same reasons and has that same deep understanding of why those soldiers signed up to serve.

Unfortunately, as my colleagues have pointed out, the person currently entrusted to be the Commander in Chief of our brave service men and women, according to many, many recent reports, including things he has actually said on TV, has made repeated comments denigrating their service, questioning their judgment, and belittling those who were prisoners of war or who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our country.

Yes, I will never forget what he said about Senator McCain when he died, as Senator McCain's friend, JACK REED, just recalled. I, too, stood in front of that cell in Vietnam with John McCain, where he had been held. When you stand there and you think about

the fact that he made the decision to allow others to be released before him—that is courage.

What does it say to our servicemembers when a Commander in Chief cancels a visit to an American cemetery in France because, according to one report, he feared his hair would be ruined by the rain? What does it say, as reported in *The Atlantic*, when he questions the value of paying his respects to fallen Americans by claiming servicemembers killed in the service of this country are “losers” and “suckers”? What does it say when he expressed his contempt for not just John McCain, who spent more than 5 years as a prisoner of war, but also accuses former President George H. W. Bush of being a “loser” for being shot down by the Japanese as a Navy pilot in World War II? Finally, what does it say to our troops when the President refuses to publicly condemn, warn, or even criticize Vladimir Putin following news reports that Russia offered bounties for the killing of members of our Armed Forces and our coalition partners?

Our servicemembers are always there for us, and we must be there for them. Even when our Nation is divided, we must still collectively reject any attempt to diminish their service.

We learned that in a big way after Vietnam. I remember standing at one of our Serving Our Troops events in Minnesota a few years ago. That is when our restaurants and the community come together—sometimes thousands of people—to serve the families of the troops who are serving overseas a steak dinner, all donated, and at the same time, the troops are somehow getting the same dinner. It is an extraordinary event. Many of us volunteer to work on the lines. One day when I was there, there was a Vietnam vet, and he was serving up mashed potatoes. He had a Vietnam hat on, and I said: Thank you for your service.

He said: When I came home, I was greeted with tomatoes. I don't want this to ever happen to another soldier again. That is why I come here every year to volunteer.

We learned back then that you can have major disagreements about war and war policy, but you do not take it out on the warriors on the frontline.

Sadly, right now, we have a Commander in Chief who takes out everything on everyone, including personal vendettas against people like Senator McCain. Rather than being silent as, sadly, too many have been in reaction to his comments, I think we must stand up. I think the way that we honor their service and sacrifice is being very clear that we condemn the remarks that the President has made.

I will end with this. The last time I saw Senator McCain I was at the ranch. He was in his last months of life. My husband and I went there and sat with Cindy and with John. At the very end, he was getting tired, and he wasn't talking much anymore. He was having trouble talking anyway. He

pointed at one of his books. I picked it up, and that is when he pointed, without saying the words, to that sentence: “There is nothing more liberating in life than fighting for a cause larger than yourself.” That is what unites our troops when they sign up to serve. That is what should unite us in this Chamber right now.

I urge my colleagues to join in this effort so that our men and women in uniform, across the United States and around the world, know that we will not remain silent.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking the Senator from Minnesota for her remarks just now.

I rise with her and to join Senator DUCKWORTH and our colleagues in responding to the shameful comments that President Trump reportedly made about our servicemembers.

I want to begin by thanking Senator DUCKWORTH for leading us in this effort and for her service to our country, as I thank all of the Members of the U.S. Senate and all of the staff of the U.S. Senate who have served their country and all of their families.

One of our Nation's greatest strengths is the countless Americans who, throughout our history, have been willing to sacrifice everything to keep us safe and preserve our freedom.

In New Hampshire, we are proud to be home to a high percentage of servicemembers, veterans, and their families. In my experience, people in my State—and all across the country—revere the bravery and sacrifices of those who serve and those who have served.

We may disagree about policy matters, including those that impact when and where servicemembers are deployed, but the respect that we have for servicemembers, veterans, and their families must be undisputed.

It is the President's duty to honor the sacrifices of our troops, to care for them, to support them and their fallen comrades. The role of the President of the United States of America is not just limited to being the Commander in Chief. Presidents should also lead by example and represent the values of the American people.

Unfortunately, President Trump has, yet again, expressed his disdain and lack of understanding of why people sacrifice for our freedom and democracy. This is a failure of leadership, and it is a failure of basic citizenship that is out of step with most Americans.

Last year, I joined a bipartisan group of Senators to travel to burial grounds in both France and Belgium, as we paid our respects to our World War II fallen servicemembers. It was the honor of a lifetime. It was also deeply personal, as my dad served in the Battle of the Bulge.

Standing on those hallowed grounds was a powerful reminder of the loss of

war, of those heroes who gave everything to fight against fascism and to protect freedom.

We owe these heroes our profound gratitude and our deepest respect. Yet, when speaking of servicemembers who were killed or captured, the President referred to these heroes as “suckers” and “losers.” For such words to come from the President of the United States is an affront to all that we stand for, and it is beneath the office that he holds. Unfortunately, these comments were not surprising given the President's long line of denigrating comments against those who have served, including the late Senator John McCain, Gold Star families, and other American heroes.

The resolution that we are introducing today recognizes the unmeasurable debt that we owe to those who have valiantly served our country, as well as their families. This resolution condemns the repeated disrespect that this President has bestowed upon them. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have seen the hurtful comments President Trump has made about members of our military. Every single one of us should condemn them.

I will close with this: My father didn't talk about his service in World War II very often, but he did talk about his unit, a group of men who came from as diverse backgrounds as our country is large. They had their disagreements. They didn't agree on politics. But they came together every day to win that war.

Of course, they knew that their lives depended on their unity, their cohesion, but they knew something else too, and this is what my dad always reminded us of. Sometimes, at the breakfast table, he would look up at us and say: “What are you doing for freedom today?” It was a question he had the right to ask because he was remembering his unit of men from all over the country, from all different life experiences, who knew that freedom, their country—our country—the United States of America, is worth fighting for.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, the day before we will be voting on a piece of legislation to deal with relief for people, for a country, dealing with coronavirus. I come to the floor today as Americans are looking to us, the U.S. Senate, to provide relief in this ongoing battle against this disease.

Republicans, as you well know, are offering a path forward. That is what the American people want. They want a path forward. So tomorrow, the Senate Republicans will move a targeted bill, a bill to help people get back to work, to help kids get back to school, and to deal with and put the disease in the rearview mirror.

It is interesting, in watching all of the things that unfold in the U.S. Senate and in the Chamber, that Democrats continue to be playing political games. The Democratic leaders in the House, as well as the Senate, have held up this round of coronavirus relief just as they held up the last round of coronavirus relief.

You say: Where is the roadblock? Well, I will tell you. Senator SCHUMER and Speaker PELOSI have been the roadblocks to relief for the American public. The Speaker has demanded a multi-trillion-dollar blank check to pursue her liberal agenda. It is a liberal wish list, no strings attached. You can go through all of the things that she has asked for. Even the New York Times said it was a liberal wish list, and that is the New York Times realizing that it wasn't a serious piece of legislation.

Yet, just last week, when Speaker PELOSI was asked about it and all of the things that are in it, she said: "We're not budging." Her statement: "We're not budging."

At the same time, as you look at what is happening in the country, Presidential nominee Joe Biden seems to be, ever so slowly, coming out of his hiding place in the basement. His answer to coronavirus, when the press asked him about this a week or so ago when he just edged out of the basement just a little bit, he said he would shut down the entire country again.

That is not what they want in Wyoming. That is not what they want in your State, Mr. Presiding Officer. That would be a recipe for disaster. But that is what the former Vice President, the nominee of the Democrat Party, has said he would do: shut down the country again. We have seen, time and time again, Democrat leaders shrink in the face of adversity. Republicans are facing challenges head-on.

It was interesting that, a couple of weeks ago during the Democrat convention, Joe Biden didn't even mention the violence that was plaguing Democrat-run cities all across the country. Not a single one of the Democrat speakers at their convention mentioned the destruction and the looting and the rioting and the violence. Democrat mayors, Democrat Governors, through their words and their actions, are encouraging these riots that are destroying our cities. They have surrendered to the leftwing mob, and, as a result, violent anarchists rule the streets in a number of the cities run by liberal mayors.

In Portland, OR, police officers have been viciously attacked for 100 days. Innocent people have been murdered in cold blood. We have seen small businesses looted, torched—a lifetime of work up in flames.

Democrat mayors are tying the hands of law enforcement, it appears to me, and liberal city officials are defunding the police, calling to defund the police, voting to defund the police. Clearly, they have refused to allow the

police to do their job. It is an incredibly dangerous situation, and it is a complete lack of leadership by Democrats.

Republicans would defend, not defund, the police. The burning, the looting, the rioting—this must stop. People are fleeing the liberal cities, and they want to move to States like ours. Even some Democrat mayors are fleeing their own homes. Portland's mayor is moving out of his condo building to escape the riots. St. Louis's mayor has temporarily relocated from her home, and the mayor of Chicago, interestingly enough, has banned protests on her block while doing nothing to protect the rest of the city, where the number of fatalities and where violence and murder are breaking records at an alltime high.

People expect their elected leaders to keep them safe, but, really, the Democrats need to get their priorities right. They don't have them right. Americans need safety and security so they can get back to a normal routine in their lives.

There really is some good news to report, and that is both with regard to coronavirus and with regard to the economy. Last week, the Wall Street Journal reported that coronavirus is starting to retreat, that positivity rates fell 40 percent from July, that hospitalizations were down 60 percent, and the good news is that researchers are reporting that they are on track to produce a safe, effective vaccine in record time.

As a doctor, I will tell you this truly is record time when I think of how long it took—years and years—for vaccines to be developed. Now, we are not out of the woods yet, but we are making significant progress and moving ahead at warp speed.

That is one of the things that is going to be on the floor tomorrow with this vote, as we work to get people back to work and kids back to school and the virus behind us, is more money and effort for testing and for treatment and for vaccine development and distribution.

The economic news is good. Joe Biden says he would shut down the country again, and this country is opening up and doing remarkably well. The economy added nearly 1.4 million jobs in August alone, 10 million new jobs in the last 4 months. The unemployment rate fell to below 9 percent—8.4 percent. That is down from a pandemic high of close to 15 percent.

It is interesting. The experts had it all wrong. The experts said that, heading into the fall, we would have an unemployment rate at over 16 percent. It is now down to 8.4. I compare this to the economic recovery that took so long when President Obama and Vice President Biden were running the economy. We had an unemployment rate of over 9 percent for 30 months in a row—over 9 percent for over 30 months. This time, with the unemployment rate, we are already below 9 percent at 8.4.

So the economy is rebounding, the virus is receding, but still there is hardship around the country, and that is why we will tomorrow vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate to deal with the needs of the American people; yet NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats in Congress remain focused on a different agenda, and I believe their misguided priorities will hurt, not help, Americans.

It is interesting, when I listen to the Speaker of the House, even over 100 Democrats wrote her and openly commented that they should be able to be allowed to vote on a targeted piece of legislation. She refused to listen to them.

But we were home for the last period, listening to folks all around my State and your State, and what did we hear them say? They said: We still need help with paycheck protection for our small businesses so they can continue to make payroll. NANCY PELOSI says no. CHUCK SCHUMER says no.

They said: We want to get our kids back to school so we can go back to work and our kids will not fall so far behind. NANCY PELOSI has said no. My concern is that, tomorrow, CHUCK SCHUMER will say no as well.

People at home said: We need a vaccine. We need more testing. We need treatments. It sounds like, tomorrow, the Democrats may say no to that as well.

I look at the list of the things that the Democrats are proposing: more money for sanctuary cities, direct payment checks to illegal immigrants, issues relating to immigration and customs enforcement. That is just the tip of the iceberg. At the same time, with their misplaced priorities, they are blocking justice reform. They did that to the TIM SCOTT justice reform bill that every one of the Republicans cosponsored. They blocked it and refused to even allow it to come to the floor for discussion. They are ignoring crime.

Clearly, the leftwing of the Democratic Party has taken the wheel and has taken a sharp left turn and is headed right off a cliff.

The Democrats' misguided priorities lie in stark contrast with Republicans' forward-looking plan. We have targeted coronavirus relief. It is a bill that will help our students, will help our workers, will help our families, will help people with the disease.

The Senate legislation sensibly extends small business paycheck protection support to help keep people on the payroll. It ensures that we beat the disease with the money that we have talked about. It gives the schools the tools they need and continue to need to reopen smartly and safely so our kids will not be left behind.

I come to the floor to say the contrast is clear. What we are hearing from the opposite side of the aisle are empty Democrat promises, and Republicans are delivering on ours. Senate Republicans are going to stay focused on governing. We are going to do the

job the American people elected us to do.

The choice could not be clearer: Republicans on a path forward or Democrats with their ongoing partisan obstruction.

I appreciate your time and your attention in this critical time as we move forward with the bill that the American public is asking us to pass, that we have Republicans supporting, that fills the needs and responds directly to the needs of the American people. At the same time tomorrow, we will see if the Democrats continue to obstruct or work with us on the solution and a path forward for our Nation. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, over the past several weeks, I have had the opportunity to visit with Colorado families and businesses across the four corners of our great State, talking about the challenges that Colorado faces when it comes to our economy as a result of the pandemic, talking about the health challenges that have been created for our State and so many of us around the world when it comes to the pandemic and the work that needs to be done and the work that this Congress needs to do to come together to stop the partisanship, to stop the fighting, to stop the arguing, and actually develop real solutions for the people of this country.

Congress has done that time and time again over the past several months. If you go back to March 6, the passage of the Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplemental Act, that was signed into law that day. That is the first action that this Chamber took when it came to coronavirus response. March 18, a couple of weeks later, Congress passed the Families First Coronavirus Response Act. That was signed into law March 18. These were unanimous consent bills—many times unanimous consent, but had the support of every Republican and every Democrat. The work we were doing was so evident, and we needed to do it immediately.

March 27, as economies were shutting down, as restaurants were closing, as hotels were closing, Congress passed the CARES Act—the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act. It was signed into law on March 27. This is when you started to see some of the partisanship that was developing as that bill's passage was delayed in the Senate. Nonetheless, it passed, delivering trillions of dollars in support for the American people, support for unemployment benefits—creating new categories of help for people who had seen their jobs eliminated, furloughed, or hours reduced—support for farmers and ranchers, support for a vaccine, support for education, mass transit, telemedicine, and beyond—trillions of dollars, almost a year's worth of appropriations, a year's worth of funding in

one bill, to help make sure that we were meeting the needs of the American people.

The actions that we take can be focused, at least the way I see it, through three primary lenses: No. 1, what we were doing to make sure we are stopping the spread and flattening the curve of coronavirus; No. 2, making sure that we are helping individuals who are in need, who are worried about how they are going to meet their rent payments, how they are going to make their mortgage, making sure that they are going to be OK.

The third filter, the third lens of actions that we need to take is to go back to our businesses and making sure they are able to keep people employed, making sure they keep their doors open, making sure that our economy can snap back to its full strength and even stronger than ever once the health pandemic is over.

We passed the Paycheck Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act on April 24 to provide additional dollars for the Paycheck Protection Program. We passed legislation that would extend the Paycheck Protection Program into August, which changed the way some of the payments are able to be made within that time and what expenses could be utilized within that timeframe.

We passed the Great American Outdoors Act, which will create thousands of jobs across the State of Colorado—100,000 jobs across this country.

We continue to do more work. There is no alpha and omega legislation when it comes to a coronavirus. There is no one single package of legislation that we can walk away from, spike the football and say: Our job is done here.

We passed one bill, two bills, three bills, four bills—and we will continue to do more because the American people need it, and the American people need that support.

I met with a restaurant owner in Pueblo, CO, who talked about the restrictions they are facing at their restaurant. They can have only 50 people in their restaurant regardless of social distancing. They can have only 50 people in their restaurant. They have a bar in their restaurant, but because they are a restaurant, they can have only 50 people. The bar down the road can have 100 people in it because they are a bar, but the restaurant can have only 50 people because they are a restaurant, even though they have a bar. They are trying to figure out and understand the regulations, the guidance they are under, making sure their customers are safe, making sure their employees can be paid, making sure they survive this and get through this.

This is what the Paycheck Protection Program represents. That is what the help we passed with unemployment benefits means. It is to help people get through this so that we can get back on our feet as a country. I met with farmers in Eastern Colorado who were struggling to find help, who couldn't

find the labor that they needed, who saw challenges to their prices before coronavirus. They saw challenges because of coronavirus to their supply chains and what was happening to the markets. The CARES Act provided aid and relief to many in agriculture across the State of Colorado, but there is more work to be done.

I met with schools across the State of Colorado that are trying to open, that are trying to figure out the best way to keep their students safe and their teachers safe and make sure they can stay open. Some were doing online learning; some were doing in-person learning. All of them were trying to figure it out.

The CARES Act and other pieces of legislation we passed provided billions of dollars for our educational institutions from kindergarten to 12th grade on up through higher education—billions and billions of dollars—but more work needs to be done.

My wife turned to me a couple of weeks ago before our three children started school and said: It is time for spring break to end. Our kids have been out since spring break in March. A week ago, they did start, but there are people and families across the State of Colorado who are unsure about whether their classes will continue in person. Maybe they never got that far.

We have to make sure we are providing help with childcare, making sure families have a place where they can take their kids when they go to work. In a country where more and more families have both parents in the workplace, it is very difficult to continue that job and to do it effectively when you don't have childcare. We have all this supply problem where we don't have enough places for families to take their kids and we have a demand challenge where you have people who need to take their kids to daycare because their schools aren't open. The CARES Act and other legislation we passed addressed that need. There is more work yet to do.

I have heard from my colleagues across the aisle that they support the Paycheck Protection Program and that they support funding for businesses so that they can keep people employed, so that businesses can hire people and get them to return to work because we made a decision that it is better to have people on the job at the workplace than in the unemployment insurance office. We passed the Paycheck Protection Program. Look at these numbers in Colorado. We have a total loan amount of over \$10 billion that went to Colorado alone to help make sure that businesses were staying open, that they could keep people on the payroll, that they could survive the orders to shut down that came from mayors and the States and the President. We did it out of love for our community to make sure that we could stop the spread, flatten the curve, and get through this together. As a result, we have an obligation to make sure that

our economy comes back and that we help those businesses and those individuals through this to make sure our Nation gets back on its feet. The legislation that we passed has done part of that.

If you look back to May 15, you think about an economy that lost 20.5 million jobs. The unemployment rate as of May 15 was 14.7 percent. Today, just a week ago, it is 8.4 percent, with more work that needs to be done.

I have heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that there is a need to support childcare and a need to support education, a need to support our efforts to get a vaccine, a need to support efforts to continue research, a need to support the post office. I have heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that there is a need to make sure we have unemployment benefits that continue for the American people.

I completely agree that we should make sure the Paycheck Protection Program continues. We should make improvements to the Paycheck Protection Program and make sure we improve the Paycheck Protection Program so that it benefits more businesses so that unrepresented communities have better access to the Paycheck Protection Program, that we get more people involved in unbanked and underbanked communities—nontraditional lenders—so we can get the Paycheck Protection Program out to them and save more jobs and get more people to work. I completely agree. Let's work together, and let's pass that.

There are people who aren't as fortunate. There are people who have lost their jobs. There are people who have seen their hours reduced, and they are terrified about how they are going to make ends meet, about what they are going to do for their job and their family. The bills don't stop. They keep coming, and they have to be paid. We should help them. We should pass unemployment insurance benefits. We should pass unemployment benefits to help the American people. Let's vote on that. Let's do that. Let's make it happen.

We should help people who need childcare. Let's make sure we are funding childcare. Let's pass it tomorrow. Let's pass it tomorrow to provide billions of dollars for childcare services. We don't have to wait; we can pass it now.

We should provide additional assistance to our farmers and ranchers. Thank goodness that we have the ability to produce our food in the United States. Imagine what would happen if we were reliant for 70 percent of our food on somebody else, like China. We have seen what happens in this country when we are reliant on China for our medications and for other personal protective equipment. Imagine if we relied on our food coming from somewhere else to the same extent.

We are blessed that we have farmers and ranchers who wake up each and

every day and work hard to put food on our table, but they are struggling right now. Let's help them. We don't have to wait. We don't have to wait another week or another month. We can pass it and vote on it tomorrow—\$20 billion for our farmers and ranchers.

We should continue our work on vaccines. I had the chance to stop at the University of Colorado to visit with Dr. Tom Campbell to learn about the trial that is taking place at the University of Colorado School of Medicine on the Anschutz Campus. They are working with the Moderna vaccine there, making sure that it goes to those who need it to get the best representative sample of how we can get the vaccine to succeed, to work, and get it into our community, but we need more help. We need more work. We need more research and development dollars. Let's vote on \$31 billion on activities like vaccine development and distribution. Let's make that happen now—\$16 billion for testing and related containment efforts.

Let's build up a personal protective equipment stockpile once again. We know we need it. Let's vote on it. Let's vote on that tomorrow—\$16 billion. Let's pass it.

This \$105 billion is more money than the House of Representatives passed. There is \$105 billion for education—for K-12 and for higher education. We have heard the need from our teachers. We have heard the need from our colleges. Let's pass that tomorrow in the bill that we are going to be voting on to provide that help. We don't have to debate; we don't have to delay. We can pass it tomorrow.

The post office—I live in rural Colorado, and my grandfather was a rural letter carrier. I remember as a child traveling with him on county roads out in Yuma County, delivering mail. Let's provide \$10 billion to the Postal Service to make sure they have the resources they need because it matters in rural Colorado. We can pass that tomorrow.

We are going to have a chance to vote on it tomorrow. Let's pass it. Let's make it happen. Let's get it done now.

Everything here that we are voting on tomorrow—\$105 billion to support students' safe return to in-person learning and educational opportunities, that is in the bill we are going to be voting on tomorrow. That \$105 billion is more than the House of Representatives asked for.

There is \$16 billion for testing and related containment efforts in the bill. Let's vote on that tomorrow.

There is \$31 billion in vaccine and development distribution, \$20 billion in farm assistance, \$15 billion to support childcare services, changes to the Paycheck Protection Program that will allow for a second loan.

I met with restaurateurs in Denver and across Colorado who said that the Paycheck Protection Program is what kept them in business. I met with

Mother Pearl in Colorado Springs—a Cajun restaurant—where they said: This saved us.

But they are still struggling. They are not up to full capacity yet. Let's give them a chance to get a second loan through the Paycheck Protection Program so that they can bring their employees back, keep their employees employed and paid, and get their doors open and through this.

Let's simplify the loan forgiveness application process so that people who have \$150,000 or less have certainty and clarity about what is going to happen to that loan. If you look at Colorado, the vast majority of the loans that represent \$10.5 billion in Paycheck Protection Program loans—95,000 loans were below \$150,000 in Colorado; 95,000 businesses could have certainty that their loan is forgiven. Let's pass that. Let's pass that tomorrow. That is in the bill.

There are enhanced unemployment benefits of \$300 a week. The State could contribute up to \$400 a week, lasting through December at the end of this year. We can pass that tomorrow. It is in the bill.

Ten billion dollars in assistance to the post office is in the bill.

Every single point that we have made here is supported by my colleagues. They want money for education. We are giving more money to education than the House of Representatives passed. They want dollars for testing. They want dollars for vaccine and distribution. They want dollars and help and support for farm assistance. They want dollars for childcare. They want dollars for the Paycheck Protection Program. They want to keep businesses open and people employed and people hired. They want to help people and businesses have more certainty in how their loans are going to be handled. They want additional unemployment benefits for the American people, and they want help for the post office.

There is not a single person who has come to the floor and said: I oppose money for higher education. They haven't done that because they agree. They agree with us. They agree with the testing and the research for the vaccine. They agree with support for childcare. They agree that we need to do it.

Maybe somebody wants more. We passed one, two, three, four, five, six—this could be the fifth, sixth, or seventh bill, depending on how you count the various pieces of legislation that have gone toward coronavirus relief. We will do more, and we should do more.

But why on Earth would you vote no tomorrow and tell the people of this country to go pound sand because you didn't get everything you wanted? Why would you tell the people who are on unemployment benefits and need it now: I am sorry, but I didn't get a tax deduction for wealthy people in California or New York so you are not getting yours. Why would you tell the people who need the dollars in education

to support our kids and our teachers: I am sorry, but you are not getting yours because somebody has a nice house in Los Angeles who needs a tax cut. Why would you tell businesses that they may not be able to keep their doors open because that house in Manhattan is really nice and you want to make sure they keep their big house tax deduction?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that the American people can wait for unemployment benefits, that they can wait for more help for businesses. They would have you believe that they don't need to vote yes on this, even though they agree with it. The American people expect us to do our jobs. The American people have the chance to see this Congress work not in a bipartisan fashion tomorrow but in a nonpartisan fashion—getting back to the very beginning of the work we did together to pass legislation to benefit and help the American people, who acted out of love to stop their economies because they wanted to stop the spread of the coronavirus. They shut their businesses and their hotels emptied out all because they were complying with efforts to socially distance in order to end this pandemic.

We have a chance tomorrow to vote on a bill that will provide unemployment benefits that will help people in ranch communities—that will provide them with billions of dollars in aid—but they are saying no because they didn't get everything. Their theory seems to be, if I can't get everything I want, you don't get anything, period.

Is that the message the American people are going to get tomorrow, that it is their way or the highway? You are not going to get the help that everybody agrees on because I just didn't get everything that I thought I should.

Look, our family business is a farm equipment dealership, and I have talked about it many times on this floor. I have never seen somebody come into that dealership and say, "My tractor is broken. I would like a Republican to fix it," or "My planter needs to be repaired. Can you please find a Democrat to fix it?" That is not the way people come into the store in our economy and do business.

They don't go into Target or Walmart that way. They don't go to that restaurant in Pueblo, in Colorado Springs, or in Denver and ask, "Could you serve me the Republican meal today, please, made by a Democrat cook?" They expect us to get the job done.

There are some in this Chamber who argue that, if we just delay a little bit longer, we will put a big, big package together. Vote tomorrow. Bring amendments. Have the debate. Don't hide behind closed doors and argue that, if we just hold out a little bit longer, maybe my tax cuts will come for that mansion in Beverly Hills or for that place in the Hamptons.

That is what they are doing. That is what they are doing to the American

people. They are saying, even though we agree, because we didn't get our way, no one gets their help, that no one gets the help they need because they didn't get their way on everything.

Tomorrow's vote isn't a final vote by any means, and even if it were, there is more work to be done. We will have additional pieces of legislation that we will continue to provide relief for, but tomorrow is the beginning of the debate. It is the first step in making sure that we have that for the American people; yet they are going to say no. They are going to vote no. They are afraid to debate. They won't even bring amendments.

The Paycheck Protection Program has saved millions of jobs around the country. We have a chance to extend it, to make it work for more people. Unemployment insurance has expired. Look, we worked over August to make sure we had an extension of unemployment insurance and unemployment benefits for the people of Colorado and this country, as well as payroll tax breaks and help with rent. This was over the last several weeks. We need to act to extend it, and we have a chance to vote on it tomorrow.

Vote yes, and we can provide that relief. Vote no, and you are telling the American people that politics is more important than policy, and that is wrong. If this body is interested in results and policy, they will vote yes to provide this relief that everybody agrees on.

Some people find the politics of pandering and partisanship way too intriguing, inviting, and alluring. The American people find it sickening. Vote yes. Get on this bill. Bring your amendments. Have the debate. Let the American people know that relief is on the way—or vote no and continue this shameless charade of people who posture about helping the American people but who are simply interested in the electoral outcome.

This vote is going to tell us a lot about people tomorrow. This vote is going to tell us about people who are interested in finding that way to relief for the American people—the opportunity is here—or is it going to simply be a chance to provide yet one more grandstand, yet one more finger-wagging, tongue-wagging opportunity for the American people to see how embarrassing the debate has become?

The people of Colorado are strong, resilient, and optimistic. They see optimism in every vale and valley as they work to climb that next peak, but they need partners to help them, and we have a chance tomorrow to vote to provide that help.

Do not be fooled by arguments that this doesn't do enough. We can do more, and we will do more, but let's start with the unemployment benefits now. Let's start with the business help now to keep people employed. Let's start with the vaccines and the research now. Let's start with the help for education now without delay.

Tomorrow, I hope the outcome is a surprise, and I hope that we will see people come together in a way that we saw at the beginning of this debate. There is always more to be done.

I ask unanimous consent to have a letter printed in the RECORD following my remarks that I wrote on April 16, with my colleague Senator BENNET and Governor Polis, that asks for more to be done.

In this letter, we talk about the need for State and local funding—a half a billion dollars for State and local funding. We also talk about other programs, including additional benefits for food nutrition. I still support that. I am still fighting for that. I still want to do those things we listed in this letter, but I am not going to let that stop me from voting yes tomorrow because the American people need it.

I hope that my colleagues will stop the partisanship, stop the gamesmanship, stop the power hungry approach to politics. Put it aside for the American people. Do what is right for the American people. Vote yes. I am delivering this critically important relief to our country so that we can stand united, as our country has stood united for months, and get through this together.

In the weeks before the economy shut down and we could no longer go to church in person, we were reviewing a passage in the Bible which read that out of our struggles and tribulations comes perseverance, that out of that perseverance is built character, and that out of that character comes hope. We can provide that hope tomorrow. The American people deserve nothing less.

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

April 16, 2020.

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

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL and LEADER SCHUMER: As you work to extend and build upon the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, we write to request certain modifications and improvements to the programs that were included in the law. We kept these requests focused on the areas under negotiation as we understand them including small business reforms, state and local funding, health care, and food assistance through the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

Since the CARES Act became law, we have spoken with Coloradans across the state about the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP), including small business owners, farmers, and non-profit directors. It is clear that we should provide additional funding for the PPP, but we should also modify the program to ensure it is providing support for as many small businesses and non-profits as the program was originally intended.

Through our conversations, we believe the following modifications and additions to the PPP can help fix the very real-on-the-ground issues preventing many small businesses from participating in the program:

Increase the program appropriations and the loan amount to 4 times average monthly payroll (permitting those that already have

loans to increase their loan amount to reach that level) for firms that have suffered significant revenue losses as a result of the COVID-19 public health emergency;

Increase the amount that can be spent on non-payroll expenses for firms that have suffered significant revenue losses as a result of the COVID-19 public health emergency;

Expand eligibility as follows:

Expressly provide that health care entities, such as quasi-governmental Critical Access Hospitals and other rural health care providers, are eligible to participate in the program;

Include certain nonprofits who should not have been excluded in the first place, subject to the applicable affiliation rules;

Expand the exception to the 500-employee limitation for franchises, which is contained in the Small Business Administration (SBA) guidance, to include franchised businesses beyond those listed in the SBA's franchise listing; and

Expand the affiliation rule exception to include more firms that, for all intents and purposes have fewer than 500 employees, such as fitness centers and retail trade establishments.

Expressly provide that, following the recently-issued SBA guidance regarding distributions from partnerships and LLCs (up to \$100,000 annualized), existing PPP loans that excluded such payments may increase their loan amounts accordingly;

Add the following to list of qualified expenses: mortgage principal payments in accordance with previously-established amortization schedules (no pre-payments), inventory expenses in advance of re-opening businesses, and past-due inventory invoices;

Expressly provide that businesses can participate in both the PPP and EIDL loans, provided that funds are not spent on the same expenses;

Set aside PPP funding to support our smallest businesses; as well as minority-, veteran-, women-owned, and other underserved businesses that may not have an existing business banking relationship;

Expressly provide that Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) are authorized lenders under the program;

Authorize the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve, and/or the SBA to purchase program loans for borrowers with 50 or more employees from the originating banks two weeks after origination; and authorize the appropriate entity purchase program loans for businesses with less than 50 employees immediately after origination; and

Ensure that small agricultural producers who employ individuals under the H-2A program can have their payroll expenses count for loan forgiveness purposes.

In addition to the PPP modifications, the Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) Program that was included in the CARES Act has been oversubscribed. The intended goal was to have these loans paired with the PPP in order to provide businesses a greater amount of liquidity. It has been clear in our communications across the state that the program is oversubscribed and EIDL needs significantly more funding and improved efficiency to get the funding more quickly into the economy. The CARES Act required EIDL advances of up to \$10,000 per loan to be delivered immediately, but the oversubscription has caused the SBA to limit the amount of those advances and they have been slow in arriving. EIDL borrowers simply cannot wait for weeks for approval on minimal advances. We must make sure the program is fully funded so it can be useful for businesses.

We must also work to provide health care providers, both those on the frontlines and those struggling with lost revenue, the support they need. We request additional fund-

ing through the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund (PHSSEF) to support hospitals and health care providers in the next phase of legislation. We must also ensure that there is a transparent and evidence-based process in place to provide relief to rural hospitals and health clinics, Medicaid providers, including home and community-based services providers, children's hospitals, nursing homes, providers treating undocumented patients, and safety net hospitals and clinics who provide critical, life-saving care to underserved populations and were not addressed in the Department of Health and Human Service's initial \$30 billion tranche of funding from the CARES Act.

Further, state and local governments and tribes are on the front lines of responding to the crisis. The CARES Act included \$150 billion for these entities from the Coronavirus Relief Fund and tens of billions of additional support for education and housing needs. In addition to direct federal support for education, housing, and public health needs, it is critical that Congress provide an additional \$500 billion in flexible fiscal relief to states and hundreds of billions of additional support directly to local governments without population thresholds and with the flexibility to fill major revenue shortfalls. We request robust funding to ensure further flexible relief in the next legislative response. In fact, any interim agreement between the leaders must include this critical state and local funding.

Lastly, we are deeply disturbed by the severe deprivation so many families are experiencing, manifested in scenes of hours-long lines at food banks across the country. To alleviate some of the pressure on the hardest-hit families, we support increasing overall SNAP benefits by 15% and continuing that increase until the public health crisis has ended and the economy has returned to pre-crisis conditions, along with other reforms to SNAP to cut red tape and expand access to nutritional assistance.

Colorado is representative of America. We have remote rural communities and large urban areas. We depend on the agriculture industry, but we also have some of the most cutting-edge technology companies in the world. We are known for our restaurants, hotels, and outdoor recreation. Those industries are supported by countless plumbers, electricians, and contractors. And like America, we have our differences, but above all, Coloradans are pragmatic—we do what works. The ideas laid out in this letter reflect what Coloradans have told us is needed to make these programs work. We should waste no time in adopting them.

We thank you for your work on behalf of the American public. We believe that we share the common goals of keeping thousands of small businesses across Colorado and the nation with the ability to retain as many workers as they can, our hospitals and health care providers equipped with what they need, and state and local governments and tribes with the ability to respond during this pandemic. Should you require additional information on these suggestions, our staffs are able to further discuss. As you negotiate the next federal response, we respectfully request you include these modifications to the CARES Act and additional requests in mind.

Sincerely,

CORY GARDNER,
United States Senator.
MICHAEL F. BENNET,
United States Senator.
JARED POLIS,
Governor of Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Jarbou, Cullen, and Gujarati nominations, in that order, at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow and that the cloture motion with respect to the motion to concur with amendment No. 2652 to the House amendment to S. 178 ripen following the disposition of the Gujarati nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

REMEMBERING KATHY BROWN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to remember one of Wyoming's most accomplished and beloved journalists. On Wednesday, August 12, 2020, Kathleen "Kathy" Suzanne Brown passed away at the age of 64. In her nearly 40 years as a reporter at the Gillette News Record, Kathy had a profound impact on communities across northeast Wyoming.

Kathy spent more than 20 years of her time at the News Record as a sports reporter. She was notably the only female sports reporter in the State for most of that time. Kathy was known for being an extremely thorough reporter. She went above and beyond to profile a majority of Campbell County's student athletes, whether or not they were the star player.

When Kathy transitioned to being an education reporter in 2012, I often had the privilege of speaking with her on my regular visits to classrooms around Gillette. Kathy was a true professional, and it was abundantly clear how much she cared for the students she wrote about.

Her dedication to journalistic excellence was recognized statewide on multiple occasions. One of the biggest highlights of her career came in 2016, when the Wyoming Press Association named her its Veteran Journalist of the Year. Kathy was also recognized by the Campbell County School District, the Energy Classic Committee, the Wyoming Education Association, and the Wyoming Historical Society for her excellent work.

While her passing leaves a huge void in the Wyoming journalism community, her legacy lives on through her more than four decades long record of compelling and insightful stories.

Bobbi and I send our deepest condolences to Kathy's mother, Shirley

Brown; brothers, Tim, Ben, and John, as well as her newspaper family at the Gillette News Record.

On August 14, 2020, Gillette News Record publisher and editor Ann Turner published a moving tribute to Kathy on behalf of the entire News Record staff who knew Kathy best. Ann's sentiments are shared by so many in Gillette and Wyoming's journalism community. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Gillette News Record, August 14, 2020]

LONGTIME NR REPORTER KATHY BROWN DIES
(By Ann Turner)

Few people in a community have the privilege of intersecting with so many lives as a reporter.

No one in Gillette has done it recently as long and as well as Kathy Brown, who was a reporter for the News Record for 37 years.

"KB," as we called her, died Wednesday night in Casper at the Central Wyoming Hospice and Transitions of complications from cancer, a disease she had valiantly fought for the past 13 months. She was 64.

She had retired from the News Record in March after working as a journalist for 41 years.

In a perfect world, there would have been a proper send-off, a party or an open house to properly acknowledge the decades that she devoted to this community. Instead, we faced a national shutdown aimed at protecting everyone from the COVID-19 pandemic, but particularly those like KB whose health was compromised by cancer and the chemotherapy she undertook to try to beat it.

She restarted the chemo after a much-too-short remission and was bound and determined to beat it.

In a perfect world, she would have beat it. In a perfect world, there would have been more stories that she could have written about all of you, her favorite people. In a perfect world, she would have enjoyed her retirement.

But the world is not perfect.

Today, we honor her with a front-page obituary, not because she would have wanted it—indeed she would have been appalled at the attention.

We do so because she deserves it.

In Gillette, she spent more than 20 years as a sports reporter, and in those years covered thousands of young athletes in the school system as well as younger and older ones in different athletic pursuits.

Kathy was the sole sports reporter at the News Record—and the only female sports reporter in the state—for most of that time. No one worked longer and harder than she did because she was committed not just to her job, but to the kids.

She made an effort to talk to every single athlete on a team—not just the stars, but every single one. She tried to make sure that they appeared in a story over the course of a season because she believed that each one of them deserved attention as part of the team. Each athlete, competing alone or on a team, had a story that deserved to be told.

A criticism that haunted her most would be those that came from some disgruntled parent who thought she was giving one player too much attention. In sports coverage, it's hard to ignore the stars. But her admiration often was focused on those whose efforts were just as noteworthy, if not as splashy.

"Always talk to those involved in events, not just a coach or teacher," she wrote in notes she handed out to younger journalists who wanted to listen to her advice. "You can use the coach or teacher's comments to build on what you're writing, but the athletes or the students are the ones who are involved in it. They have a lot to say, too, and shouldn't be ignored."

In 2012, she moved from the sports beat to education and the community section. The move was made for health reasons, but she ended up working just as hard covering those beats as she did sports.

She was a prolific writer and still holds the byline record at the News Record. There was never a topic too small, but there were some that she could write reams about, usually involving her love of history, particularly local or Western history.

She once decided to write about the Pumpkin Buttes, a story that originally was supposed to anchor the front page.

She wrote so much that it ended up being a special section.

That was true of the Recreation Center when it opened 10 years ago. The story was supposed to be a comprehensive look at what the new facility was like.

It ended up being a 28-page special section with multiple stories, all written in a very short amount of time by KB.

In both of those cases, just like with most stories she wrote, she approached them with an enthusiasm that is rare.

"I'm sucking the life out of this interview in three different ways," she once said about an interview with one of the National High School Finals Rodeo contestants.

She loved journalism because no two days are alike. "Every day is a new adventure," she said in 2017.

She also loved it because it put her smack-dab in the middle of people and their stories, which is where she liked to be.

"I really feel it's a privilege to cover the stories of the people in Campbell County and to be able to tell about their lives," she said.

She has been honored many times for her reporting and her leadership. Three years ago, she was chosen as Veteran Journalist of the Year by the Wyoming Press Association, an occasion that made her reflect on her career, as well as to find humor in the "veteran" part of the name.

"Heck," she said. "It's just one for old farts."

"I want to tell the stories we all want to read—the important ones that teach us about life, ourselves and our community at the same time," she said at the time. "No one else can tell the story of a community as well as a newspaper, so it's a service to a community and a calling to those of us on the job."

It was her humility that made her sum up the award by saying, "I guess it means I'm doing OK at the job."

That prompted a reply from frequent letter writer Brad Schofield.

"In my opinion, the ability to 'write and relate' is not only a gift she has shared and worked so hard to achieve, it is a dedication to a life of serving a people and a community she obviously loves and respects," he wrote.

A newspaper contest judge once called KB "a consummate pro." And she was. People in Gillette were lucky to have her on their side for 37 years.

We were even luckier to be able to call her a colleague. Even more so a friend.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING MORGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

• Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Morgan Community

College in celebration of its 50th anniversary. Since the first day of class in 1970, Morgan Community College has prepared students from all walks of life for future success with dedication and compassion. The institution plays a critical role on the Eastern Plains of Colorado with programs that provide a strong knowledge base and serve as a springboard to future economic prosperity.

As part of its commitment to providing high-quality, affordable higher education opportunities, Morgan Community College offers an expansive assortment of over 80 courses and a variety of curriculum tracks to ensure that students are able to find an educational path that best supports their goals. Furthermore, Morgan Community College is nationally recognized for its high graduation and transfer rates into 4-year institutions, indicating its ability to serve students' unique objectives.

Morgan Community College continues to innovate and develop groundbreaking new programs to support the needs of the local communities. On August 17, 2020, the college celebrated the opening of Poplar Hall, an educational building to be utilized for the college's precision agriculture program. The development of Poplar Hall demonstrates the college's investment in and dedication towards the next generation of Colorado farmers and ranchers.

The indispensable services Morgan Community College provides to its students have been recognized on multiple occasions, earning the college a top 10 ranking in SmartAsset's 2020 Best Community Colleges in America. In addition, Morgan Community College has been continuously named a "great college to work for" by the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Morgan Community College offers immeasurable value to communities in Eastern Colorado, and the institution has a bright future. Sincerest congratulations on this 50th anniversary milestone.●

TRIBUTE TO KENDRA SMITH

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize Kendra Smith of Nashua as August's Granite Stater of the Month. At a time when so many are facing financial uncertainty, Kendra is selflessly working to provide substantial and popular hot meals to community members in need amid this public health and economic crisis.

Kendra has lived in Nashua for 29 years and knows her community well. As a food service assistant in New Hampshire's school system and an entrepreneur who founded a soul food cuisine catering business early last year, Kendra is exceedingly familiar with how food insecurity affects children and teenagers in Nashua.

When schools began to shut down due to COVID-19, Kendra knew that many students in her community were at

risk of going hungry without school-provided meals. Kendra, whose background in catering and food service has given her plenty of practice serving a lot of food on a tight budget, started a program to help get hot meals to those in need.

Feed the Children is a nonprofit organization that Kendra started through her catering company, Soel (Simply Offering Edible Love) Sistas, LLC. Her organization is fueled by the generosity of people in her community, who support the effort by, among other things, making small donations and holding food drives.

Twice a week, Kendra and her team drive to neighborhoods around Nashua and distribute hot meals to families in need, while following social distancing guidance. Menu items include burgers, chicken and rice bowls, chips, granola bars, and fruit.

Food insecurity affects communities across our State and our country, and in times like these, it is especially important that we come together to support those in need. I am proud to recognize Kendra's initiative, generosity, and pragmatism in naming her August 2020's Granite Stater of the Month. She exemplifies the best of New Hampshire and shows what can be done when we come together as a community during challenging times.●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID ABNEY

● Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, one of America's founding principles is the belief that anyone of any background can achieve anything with hard work, perseverance, and a positive attitude. This belief is the very foundation of the American dream.

Mr. David Abney, who is retiring after over 40 years at Georgia's own UPS, is the epitome of the American dream.

David grew up in the Mississippi Delta, which is one of the most economically challenged areas in the country. Yet David didn't let his circumstances determine his fate. From an early age, David worked odd jobs to help support his family while making sure he kept his grades up at school. This dedication paid off when he got into Delta State University on scholarship, where he met his future wife, Sherry.

At the age of 19, while working as a package loader at UPS to pay for his education, a manager recognized David's talent and work ethic and encouraged him to join the company full time. Although he didn't realize it at the time, this encouragement transformed David's life. It was then that David became, as they say, "brown-blooded," devoting his career to UPS.

Although he had found his professional home, the road ahead wasn't always easy. The work could be grueling. He moved around a lot. He often put in difficult hours. However, just as he had diligently worked his way into college, David worked his way up the ladder.

What has always made David an exceptional leader is his devotion to the people who work for him. Having done the work himself, David understood the needs and challenges of his employees, and he always put their needs over his own. In one case, when the center he managed experienced difficult times, David laid himself off so that his employees could keep their jobs.

This selfless, employee-oriented leadership style eventually propelled David to the highest levels of leadership at UPS. He became COO in 2007, CEO in 2014, chairman of the board in 2016.

Under David's leadership, UPS has grown into one of the most exceptional logistics companies in the world. He guided UPS through major changes, adapting to the new needs of the digital world. He focused on strengthening the company's diversity and inclusion practices, so that anyone, of any background, would always find a home at UPS just as he had.

Today, UPS supports hundreds of thousands of jobs and helps our economy grow and thrive every day.

The values of hard work, optimism, and service to others that have guided David's life are infused into the company that he has led. For example, during the COVID-19 crisis, UPS helped manage logistics to deliver critical aid to those who needed it. UPS workers put their own health and safety at risk to serve their communities.

David's devotion to serving others extends beyond UPS. He has helped support local businesses as the chairman of the Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. He served on the board of Catalyst, which works to bring women, particularly women of color, into senior leadership positions. He frequently supports his alma mater, so that the next generation of bright young students can find success no matter where they come from.

As David Abney prepares to retire from UPS this year, he will be leaving an incredible legacy of excellence, growth, and selfless service. He has made UPS, the State of Georgia, and the entire country a better place.

It is my pleasure to wish David, his wife Sherry, and their entire family the very best.●

REMEMBERING RONNIE LOPEZ

● Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Ronnie Lopez, a beloved man to, and community leader in Arizona. Lopez is intimately known around the Valley by many for his efforts championing public policies and civic engagement for Phoenix's Latino community.

Born in the small mining town of Miami, AZ, Ronnie was raised alongside his two older brothers by his hard-working mother, who cleaned houses and worked in the area mines to provide for their family. Ronnie's professional career in Phoenix began in the mid 1960s as a field representative for the Arizona State Civil Rights Commis-

sion, where he investigated discrimination allegations. Shortly after, Ronnie extended his expertise to Chicanos Por La Causa, an organization dedicated to supporting underserved Latinos in Phoenix, and was elected justice of the peace in West Phoenix. In 1978, Ronnie accepted a position to serve on the staff of Arizona Governor Bruce Babbitt, where he championed better housing and education for the Latino community. In the many years that followed, Ronnie ran his own consulting firm—working with government leaders, businesses, and public campaigns to facilitate change for Arizonans in need. In what free time he had left, Ronnie endeavored to mentor many of Arizona's young public servants, some of whom serve as elected officials today. Above all else, those who had the pleasure of working with Ronnie will remember him for his selflessness.

Please join me in honoring life of Ronnie Lopez, a devoted leader, mentor, and personal friend whose impact will not be forgotten.●

REMEMBERING DR. GABRIEL LÓPEZ-PLASCENCIA

● Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Dr. Gabriel López-Plascencia—Dr. López—a well-known physician from metro-Phoenix who practiced medicine for over six decades. Dr. López was the primary physician for many low-income families living in Phoenix's underserved communities.

Born in Jalisco, Mexico, Dr. López attended the University of Guadalajara before eventually moving to the United States and enlisting in the Arizona National Guard as a medical officer. He served the Arizona Guard for 20 years, retiring as a lieutenant colonel. Even then he continued to support and collaborate with the Guard through additional activations until the mid 1990s. In addition to his military service, Dr. López made a point to make his services available to indigent populations in South Phoenix, where poverty has affected predominantly Latino communities for decades. As an active Mexican American, he was also one of the founding members of the Mexican American Chamber of Commerce in Phoenix. Dr. López's community-oriented spirit, expertise, and dedication to service contributed to the health of many Arizona working families and allowed them to seek the American dream just as he did many years ago.

Please join me in honoring the life of Dr. Gabriel López-Plascencia, a passionate doctor, surgeon, and servant to Arizonans, who will be dearly missed. The impact Dr. López has left in our hearts, his community, and our State will be felt eternally.●

TRIBUTE TO ALLEN NICHOLAS

● Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Allen Nicholas who is retiring as forest supervisor for

the National Forests in North Carolina. Mr. Nicholas has served for over 30 years and has been a living embodiment of the National Forest Service's motto, "Caring for the Land and Serving People."

Mr. Nicholas was born in Magnolia, MS, and graduated from Mississippi State University with a bachelor's degree in forest resource management and then with a master's degree in business administration. He began his career as a silvicultural technician in the Daniel Boone National Forest and went on to serve in numerous natural resource and leadership positions throughout the southern and eastern United States.

When he arrived to his first forest supervisor position on the Shawnee National Forest, equestrian use across the forest was rampant. Mr. Nicholas led a multiyear effort to reduce the impact of trail use on natural resources while also supporting an equestrian-based tourism economy.

As forest supervisor, Mr. Nicholas oversaw North Carolina's four National Forests. The Croatan, the Nantahala, the Pisgah, and the Uwharrie National Forests contain more than 1.25 million acres of land that stretches from the Appalachian Mountains to the Atlantic Coast. All together, the forests welcome more than 7 million visitors each year. Mr. Nicholas led a team to reduce the number of accidental visitor deaths in National Forests in the southern region. Under his leadership, the team recommended a set of actions that are now being implemented to track data, improve communication to visitors, and provide more official presence through volunteers and partners. Mr. Nicholas demonstrates an impressive talent for balancing the safety of visitors with responsible stewardship of our Nation's natural resources.

All who interact with Allen Nicholas—and countless more past, present, and future visitors—benefit greatly from his service. His commitment to the betterment of others is reflected in his lasting relationships with Forest Service employees and the public. His words inspire and empower, and he leads by example with his actions. Quite simply, he is a natural mentor to others and a wonderful example of a public servant.

Please join me in congratulating Allen Nicholas, his wife Debra, daughters and sons-in-law, Anna Lisa and Taylor Roberts, and Kelsey and Garrett Dismukes, and his grandchildren Gracie and Charlie on his distinguished public service career and retirement. I wish him and his family the best in his future endeavors.●

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-5292. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pur-

suant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001, with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5293. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Failure to Attain by the Attainment Date and Denial of Serious Area Attainment Date Extension Request; Alaska: Fairbanks North Star Borough 2006 24-hour Fine Particulate Matter Serious Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 10011-59-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5294. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; California; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District and Feather River Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 10012-28-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5295. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Negative Declaration for the Oil and Gas Industry" (FRL No. 10012-83-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5296. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Failure to Attain by the Attainment Date and Denial of Serious Area Attainment Date Extension Request; Alaska: Fairbanks North Star Borough 2006 24-hour Fine Particulate Matter Serious Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 10011-59-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5297. 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; Beaumont-Port Arthur Area Second Maintenance Plan for 1997 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 10012-88-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5298. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of Significant New Use Rule for a Certain Chemical Substance (P-16-581)" (FRL No. 10012-90-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5299. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Jefferson County Existing and New Miscellaneous Metal Parts and Products Surface Coating Operations" (FRL No. 10012-91-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5300. 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; Rhode Island; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 2008 and 2015 Ozone Standards" (FRL No. 10013-00-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5301. 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 Approvals; Kentucky; Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Modeling Infrastructure Requirements for 2015 Ozone NAAQS" (FRL No. 10013-28-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5302. 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: Miscellaneous Organic Chemical Manufacturing Residual Risk and Technology Review" (FRL No. 10010-27-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5303. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Correction to the Flex-fuel Vehicle Provisions in CAFE Regulations (DFR)" (FRL No. 10012-25-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-233. A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, California, urging the United States Congress to expeditiously pass and enact subsequent interim emergency coronavirus relief stimulus packages in addition to the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1004. A bill to increase the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Field Operations officers and support staff and to require reports that identify staffing, infrastructure, and equipment needed to enhance security at ports of entry (Rept. No. 116-264).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 4024. A bill to establish in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security a Cybersecurity Advisory Committee (Rept. No. 116-265).

S. 4157. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to expand the authority of

the National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-266).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

H.R. 5273. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a plan to increase to 100 percent the rates of scanning of commercial and passenger vehicles entering the United States at land ports of entry along the border using large-scale non-intrusive inspection systems to enhance border security, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-267).

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. TILLIS:

S. 4542. A bill to prohibit distribution abroad of COVID-19 vaccines developed with the support of Federal funding until the domestic need for the vaccine has been met; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 4543. A bill to subsidize the salaries of State and local law enforcement officers and promote officer hiring and retention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 4544. A bill to specify the Federal share of the costs of certain duty of the National Guard in connection with the Coronavirus Disease 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 4545. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the Zero Suicide Initiative pilot program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4546. A bill to provide for the prompt payment of United States assessed contributions to international organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4547. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring uniform safety and performance standards, including a horseracing anti-doping and medication control program and a racetrack safety program to be developed and enforced by an independent Horseracing Integrity and Safety Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 4548. A bill to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on global basic education programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. COONS):

S. 4549. A bill to give Federal courts additional discretion to determine whether pre-

trial detention is appropriate for defendants charged with nonviolent drug offenses in Federal criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mrs. LOEFFLER):

S. 4550. A bill to amend section 3142 of title 18, United States Code, to establish a rebuttable presumption that a person arrested for rioting or related offenses should be held pending trial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mrs. LOEFFLER):

S. 4551. A bill to provide a cause of action for persons injured by rioting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4552. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mrs. LOEFFLER):

S. 4553. A bill to hold individuals convicted of Federal offenses during public gatherings resulting in riots financially liable for the cost of Federal policing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 4554. A bill to provide compensation for United States victims of Libyan state sponsored terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 685. A resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces and veterans and condemning the disgraceful denigration by President Donald Trump of military service, prisoners of war, and Gold Star families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER:

S. Res. 686. A resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces, veterans, prisoners of war, and Gold Star families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 180

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 180, a bill to streamline the oil and gas permitting process and to recognize fee ownership for certain oil and gas drilling or spacing units, and for other purposes.

S. 274

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 274, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 393

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 393, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices and judges of the courts of the United States.

S. 593

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to protect civil rights and otherwise prevent meaningful harm to third parties, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. COONS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, *supra*.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to provide for the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall of the names of the lost crew members of the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans killed on June 3, 1969.

S. 861

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 861, a bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBTI Peoples, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 861, *supra*.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors 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. 1068

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1068, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 1103

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1103, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a skills-based immigration points system, to focus on family-sponsored immigration on spouses and minor children, to eliminate the Diversity Visa Program, to set a limit on the number of refugees admitted annually to the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1219

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1219, a bill to provide for the discharge of parent borrower liability if a student on whose behalf a parent has received certain student loans becomes disabled.

S. 1374

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1609

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1609, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1934 to require country-by-country reporting.

S. 2001

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2001, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O’Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 2008

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2008, a bill to prohibit, as an unfair or decep-

tive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 2043

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2043, a bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish alternative sentencing for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shephard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

S. 2227

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2227, a bill to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for re-investment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes.

S. 2898

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2898, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 3101

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3101, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the cover over of distilled spirits taxes to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and to transfer a portion of such cover over to the Puerto Rico Conservation Trust Fund.

S. 3176

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 3398

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3398, a bill to establish a National Commission on Online Child Sexual Exploitation Prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 3424

At the request of Mr. UDALL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3424, a bill to end preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States and close disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes.

S. 3471

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from

Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3471, a bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People’s Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

S. 3705

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3705, a bill to establish a private-public partnership to preserve jobs in the aviation manufacturing industry, and for other purposes.

S. 3872

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 4071

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4071, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to adjust identification number requirements for taxpayers filing joint returns to receive Economic Impact Payments.

S. 4124

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4124, a bill to expedite hiring by the Department of Veterans Affairs of medical department personnel separating from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 4150

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 4150, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide assistance to certain providers of transportation services affected by the novel coronavirus.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4150, *supra*.

S. 4202

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4202, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand online benefit redemption options under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 4258

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4258, a bill to establish a grant program for small live venue operators and talent representatives.

S. 4275

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee

(Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4275, a bill to require recipients of Pandemic Unemployment Assistance to provide employment documentation, and for other purposes.

S. 4329

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4329, a bill to provide premium assistance for COBRA continuation coverage, church plan continuation coverage, and furloughed continuation coverage for individuals and their families.

S. 4357

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4357, a bill to amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 to promote reforestation following unplanned events on Federal land, and for other purposes.

S. 4380

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4380, a bill to provide redress to the employees of Air America.

S. 4393

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4393, a bill to improve the provision of health care and other benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans who were exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

S. 4406

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4406, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to fully protect the safety of children and the environment, to remove dangerous pesticides from use, and for other purposes.

S. 4424

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4424, a bill to withhold a percentage of Federal funding from State and local prosecutors who fail to faithfully prosecute crimes related to protests and riots.

S. 4441

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4441, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to encourage State Medicaid programs to provide community-based mobile crisis intervention services, and for other purposes.

S. 4442

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4442, a bill to amend subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act to provide Pandemic Unemployment Assistance to individuals with mixed income sources, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 372

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 372, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should establish a national goal of conserving at least 30 percent of the land and ocean of the United States by 2030.

S. RES. 524

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 524, a resolution condemning the practice of politically motivated imprisonment, calling for the immediate release of political prisoners in the Russian Federation, and urging action by the United States Government to impose sanctions with respect to persons responsible for that form of human rights abuse.

S. RES. 671

At the request of Mr. COONS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 671, a resolution recognizing, commemorating, and celebrating the 55th anniversary of the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and reaffirming the Senate's commitment to ensuring the continued vitality of the Act and the protection of the voting rights of all citizens of the United States.

S. RES. 672

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 672, a resolution designating September 2020 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

S. RES. 675

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 675, a resolution congratulating the men and women of the Commercial Crew Program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Space Exploration Technologies Corporation and astro-

nauts Robert L. Behnken and Douglas G. Hurley on the successful completion of the Crew Dragon Demo-2 test flight.

S. RES. 684

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 684, a resolution calling on the Government of Cameroon and separatist armed groups from the English-speaking Northwest and Southwest regions to end all violence, respect the human rights of all Cameroonians, and pursue a genuinely inclusive dialogue toward resolving the ongoing civil conflict in Anglophone Cameroon.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 4543. A bill to subsidize the salaries of State and local law enforcement officers and promote officer hiring and retention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to address the growing crisis in our country, in our cities and towns across our country: a crisis of law and order, yes, a crisis of the rule of law, a crisis of confidence, a crisis of solidarity. As our cities and towns come under siege, as so many of them descend into violence and lawlessness night after night, we witness before our eyes the fraying of the American fabric, the breaking of American bonds.

The violence that we are witnessing is not just about the individual lives harmed or lost, neighborhoods destroyed, businesses burned and looted, families living in fear, whole neighborhoods cowering behind locked doors. No. The devastation that we are seeing, the crisis that we are facing is about the confidence in our society itself, in our ability to come together, to live together, to find common ground, to build this common community and pursue that more perfect union. All of that is under threat in this current crisis of lawlessness, of lack of respect for the rule of law, of the decline of due process and law and order.

Let's just be clear. These are not peaceful protests that we are seeing across the country. They are violent and increasingly violent riots and attacks and looting, and I am sorry to say that too many in the media and my colleagues across the aisle are appeasing the mobs and the Marxists whose desire is to burn our cities down, to burn our neighborhoods to the ground.

These attacks are occurring because they are increasingly enabled by the mainstream press and local and national politicians who are pushing a historically fraudulent version of American history, one where America is a fundamentally racist nation, one where America is systemically evil, one where police officers are cast as agents of oppression.

What our leaders fail to recognize is that our police officers, the brave men

and women in blue, those who choose day in and day out, of their own volition, of their own accord, to go out to the streets, to put their lives on the line to serve and protect their neighborhoods, their fellow citizens, and to stand for our values—those police officers are an example and exemplars of our deepest held and most cherished beliefs because, without those police officers—let's just be clear—the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, those things are just words on a page.

Without law enforcement officers giving their lives, risking their lives to enforce and make available the fair and equal rule of law, well, our Constitution is just a parchment barrier. It may as well not exist.

Now, our police officers are the best among us. They are the guardians of our neighborhoods. They are the sentries on the streets. But too often now, in the press, right here in this body, we hear attacks on police officers, we hear rushes to judgment. These voices of criticism don't see police as human beings, as working men and women whose experience and lives mirror our own, and too often these critics don't see the suffering, the suicides, the low morale that police officers across this Nation face.

The consequences of this mistreatment that law enforcement are facing in this country are becoming ever clearer. Police departments are facing increasing retirements. They are struggling to retain the officers they have and struggling to hire new ones. Local law enforcement report plummeting morale as officers face increasing violence and police departments struggle to pay their officers a salary that is commensurate with the work that they do, work that is more challenging today with the riots and looting sweeping across our cities.

What our officers need is not less funding. What they need is not defunding. What they need is not disrespect. What they need is support. What they need is for the leaders of this country and the good men and women of this country to say: We are with you; we support you; we will stand with you in the important and vital job that you do. They need more funding, not less; more recognition, not less.

Our Federal Government exists to provide for the general welfare. Well, I believe it is time that Congress lived up to that promise. So let's make it simple. Let's give our officers a pay raise. Let's give a pay raise to every cop in America, and let's do it right now. Let's provide new funding for police departments across this Nation to hire more cops and to put them out on the beat. Let's put our money where our mouth is and stand by our law enforcement in this vital time for them and this vital time for our Nation.

That is why, today, I am introducing legislation to back our police. My bill would authorize new funding through the Department of Justice to permit

State and local police to raise the salaries of officers up to 110 percent of local median earnings. That is a real wage boost, and it would be available under my bill right now. It would provide funding to hire new officers to boost manpower, and it would withhold this funding from any city or jurisdiction that defunds their police and tries to cut officer pay.

I can tell you, for law enforcement in States like mine, in Missouri, this could mean a raise of thousands of dollars a year, and our law enforcement deserve it. Not only would this legislation help officers; it would help all Americans by working to build a safer nation for our families to thrive and our communities to grow as one people together. Through safety, we can have solidarity.

This bill is named in honor of David Dorn, the retired St. Louis police captain who was killed in June trying to protect his neighbors and his friends and his own neighborhood from violent looters. It is dedicated to all of those officers who have been a victim of violence this year.

It is time that we rejected the false narrative that the police are inherently oppressive; that America is inherently evil; that structural racism and structural oppression define this country, its past, its present, and its future; and that the police are instruments of this oppression, of this history, of this evil.

It simply isn't true. Instead, it is time to stand, again, with our law enforcement, to affirm the vital work that they do, to affirm the vital role that they play in making available the rule of law for every American, in making available and protecting the vital rights of every American. And it is time—by recommitting ourselves to safe streets, to the rule of law, to due process—to work on re forging those bonds of community, of solidarity, and of togetherness that are being torn apart night after night after night with the burning and the rioting in our streets.

It is a fundamental choice we face. No nation can long endure lawlessness. No nation can long endure the breakdown of the basic operation of law. That is why the job that our law enforcement officers do night after night on that thin blue line is so vital. It is time that we stood up and thanked them for it. It is time that we stood up and supported them in it.

May God bless our men and women who go to stand on that line every night.

By Mr. McCONNELL (for himself,
Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MCSALLY,
and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4547. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring uniform safety and performance standards, including a horseracing anti-doping and medication control program and a racetrack safety program to be developed and enforced by

an independent Horseracing Integrity and Safety Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this year's Kentucky Derby showed that our great traditions can adapt to overcome any challenge. But our sport must be protected.

I have been proud to stand up for Kentucky horse racing throughout my career. I introduced a checkoff bill to promote the sport domestically. I assembled a coalition to open new markets in Japan and Hong Kong. I worked to make sure internet regulations did not unduly restrict the racing industry. I have secured tax provisions to promote equine equity and grow investment in Kentucky. It has been my privilege to deliver for this sport and Kentuckians who stand behind it.

Today, I am introducing new legislation to keep it up because, unfortunately, the coronavirus isn't thoroughbred racing's only challenge. In recent years, tragedies on the track, medication scandals, and an inconsistent patchwork of regulations have cast clouds over the future. A national publication's editorial board even called for this sport to be abolished altogether.

We needed action to protect the sport we love, to defend our history and the 24,000 Kentuckians who work in the thoroughbred racing industry. So in Lexington, the horse capital of the world, I announced with my friend Congressman ANDY BARR that we had found a way forward.

Today I will introduce the Horseracing Integrity and Safety Act to recognize a uniform, national standard for thoroughbred racing. Baseball, football, and other professional sports have a central regulatory authority. Thoroughbred racing should as well.

Some of the biggest names in the sport—Churchill Downs, Keeneland, the Breeders' Cup and the Jockey Club, just to name a few—are supporting our plan to provide Federal recognition and enforcement power to an independent Horseracing Integrity and Safety Authority.

The board will be made up of both industry-selected and independent members. It will set national standards for track safety, anti-doping, and medication practices and lab protocols. This will make thoroughbred racing as fair and as safe as possible.

I am proud to partner with Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND on this bipartisan legislation. New York is home to another leg of the Triple Crown. Their junior Senator has previously introduced similar legislation to protect our sport. I am also glad to have the senior Senator from California and the junior Senator from Arkansas as original co-sponsors on this bill.

Today, Congressman BARR and Congressman TONKO will present this legislation over in the House. I am grateful for Congressman BARR's years of leadership on this issue, and I am glad we

are making bipartisan, bicameral progress with our bill. This way, when we can all return to the grandstands to watch the thoroughbreds round the final turn toward a thundering finish, we will be taking pride in a fair and safe race.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 4547

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Horseracing Integrity and Safety Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—The term “Authority” means the Horseracing Integrity and Safety Authority designated by section 3(a).

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(3) **COVERED HORSE.**—The term “covered horse” means any Thoroughbred horse, or any other horse made subject to this Act by election of the applicable State racing commission or the breed governing organization for such horse under section 5(k), during the period—

(A) beginning on the date of the horse’s first timed and reported workout at a racetrack that participates in covered horseraces or at a training facility; and

(B) ending on the date on which the Authority receives written notice that the horse has been retired.

(4) **COVERED HORSE RACE.**—The term “covered horserace” means any horserace involving covered horses that has a substantial relation to interstate commerce, including any Thoroughbred horserace that is the subject of interstate off-track or advance deposit wagers.

(5) **COVERED PERSONS.**—The term “covered persons” means all trainers, owners and breeders, jockeys, racetracks, veterinarians, persons (legal and natural) licensed by a State racing commission and the agents, assigns, and employees of such persons and other horse support personnel who are engaged in the care, training, or racing of covered horses.

(6) **EQUINE CONSTITUENCIES.**—The term “equine constituencies” means, collectively, owners and breeders, trainers, racetracks, veterinarians, State racing commissions, and jockeys who are engaged in the care, training, or racing of covered horses.

(7) **EQUINE INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVE.**—The term “equine industry representative” means an organization regularly and significantly engaged in the equine industry, including organizations that represent the interests of, and whose membership consists of, owners and breeders, trainers, racetracks, veterinarians, State racing commissions, and jockeys.

(8) **HORSE RACING ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL PROGRAM.**—The term “horseracing anti-doping and medication control program” means the anti-doping and medication program established under section 6(a).

(9) **IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.**—The term “immediate family member” shall include a spouse, domestic partner, mother, father, aunt, uncle, sibling, or child.

(10) **INTERSTATE OFF-TRACK WAGER.**—The term “interstate off-track wager” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the

Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 (15 U.S.C. 3002).

(11) **JOCKEY.**—The term “jockey” means a rider or driver of a covered horse in covered horseraces.

(12) **OWNERS AND BREEDERS.**—The term “owners and breeders” means those persons who either hold ownership interests in covered horses or who are in the business of breeding covered horses.

(13) **PROGRAM EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The term “program effective date” means the earlier of—

(A) January 1 of the second year after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) the date that is 540 days after such date of enactment.

(14) **RACETRACK.**—The term “racetrack” means an organization licensed by a State racing commission to conduct covered horseraces.

(15) **RACETRACK SAFETY PROGRAM.**—The term “racetrack safety program” means the program established under section 7(a).

(16) **STAKES RACE.**—The term “stakes race” means any race so designated by the racetrack at which such race is run, including, without limitation, the races comprising the Breeders’ Cup World Championships and the races designated as graded stakes by the American Graded Stakes Committee of the Thoroughbred Owners and Breeders Association.

(17) **STATE RACING COMMISSION.**—The term “State racing commission” means an entity designated by State law or regulation that has jurisdiction over the conduct of horseracing within the applicable State.

(18) **TRAINER.**—The term “trainer” means an individual engaged in the training of covered horses.

(19) **TRAINING FACILITY.**—The term “training facility” means a location that is not a racetrack licensed by a State racing commission that operates primarily to house covered horses and conduct official timed workouts.

(20) **VETERINARIAN.**—The term “veterinarian” means a licensed veterinarian who provides veterinary services to covered horses.

(21) **WORKOUT.**—The term “workout” means a timed running of a horse over a predetermined distance not associated with a race or its first qualifying race, if such race is made subject to this Act by election under section 5(k) of the horse’s breed governing organization or the applicable State racing commission.

SEC. 3. RECOGNITION OF THE HORSE RACING INTEGRITY AND SAFETY AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The private, independent, self-regulatory, nonprofit corporation, to be known as the “Horseracing Integrity and Safety Authority”, is recognized for purposes of developing and implementing a horseracing anti-doping and medication control program and a racetrack safety program for covered horses, covered persons, and covered horseraces.

(b) **BOARD OF DIRECTORS.**—

(1) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Authority shall be governed by a board of directors (in this section referred to as the “Board”) comprised of nine members as follows:

(A) **INDEPENDENT MEMBERS.**—Five members of the Board shall be independent members selected from outside the equine industry.

(B) **INDUSTRY MEMBERS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Four members of the Board shall be industry members selected from among the various equine constituencies.

(ii) **REPRESENTATION OF EQUINE CONSTITUENCIES.**—The industry members shall be representative of the various equine constituencies, and shall include not more than one

industry member from any one equine constituency.

(2) **CHAIR.**—The chair of the Board shall be an independent member described in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) **BYLAWS.**—The Board of the Authority shall be governed by bylaws for the operation of the Authority with respect to—

(A) the administrative structure and employees of the Authority;

(B) the establishment of standing committees;

(C) the procedures for filling vacancies on the Board and the standing committees;

(D) term limits for members and termination of membership; and

(E) any other matter the Board considers necessary.

(c) **STANDING COMMITTEES.**—

(1) **ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL STANDING COMMITTEE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Authority shall establish an anti-doping and medication control standing committee, which shall provide advice and guidance to the Board on the development and maintenance of the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program.

(B) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The anti-doping and medication control standing committee shall be comprised of seven members as follows:

(i) **INDEPENDENT MEMBERS.**—A majority of the members shall be independent members selected from outside the equine industry.

(ii) **INDUSTRY MEMBERS.**—A minority of the members shall be industry members selected to represent the various equine constituencies, and shall include not more than one industry member from any one equine constituency.

(iii) **QUALIFICATION.**—A majority of individuals selected to serve on the anti-doping and medication control standing committee shall have significant, recent experience in anti-doping and medication control rules.

(C) **CHAIR.**—The chair of the anti-doping and medication control standing committee shall be an independent member of the Board described in subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) **RACETRACK SAFETY STANDING COMMITTEE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Authority shall establish a racetrack safety standing committee, which shall provide advice and guidance to the Board on the development and maintenance of the racetrack safety program.

(B) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The racetrack safety standing committee shall be comprised of seven members as follows:

(i) **INDEPENDENT MEMBERS.**—A majority of the members shall be independent members selected from outside the equine industry.

(ii) **INDUSTRY MEMBERS.**—A minority of the members shall be industry members selected to represent the various equine constituencies.

(C) **CHAIR.**—The chair of the racetrack safety standing committee shall be an industry member of the Board described in subsection (b)(1)(B).

(d) **NOMINATING COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The nominating committee of the Authority shall be comprised of seven independent members selected from business, sports, and academia.

(B) **INITIAL MEMBERSHIP.**—The initial nominating committee members shall be set forth in the governing corporate documents of the Authority.

(C) **VACANCIES.**—After the initial committee members are appointed in accordance with subparagraph (B), vacancies shall be filled by the Board pursuant to rules established by the Authority.

(2) CHAIR.—The chair of the nominating committee shall be selected by the nominating committee from among the members of the nominating committee.

(3) SELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND STANDING COMMITTEES.—

(A) INITIAL MEMBERS.—The nominating committee shall select the initial members of the Board and the standing committees described in subsection (c).

(B) SUBSEQUENT MEMBERS.—The nominating committee shall recommend individuals to fill any vacancy on the Board or on such standing committees.

(c) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—To avoid conflicts of interest, the following individuals may not be selected as a member of the Board or as an independent member of a nominating or standing committee under this section:

(1) An individual who has a financial interest in, or provides goods or services to, covered horses.

(2) An official or officer—

(A) of an equine industry representative; or

(B) who serves in a governance or policymaking capacity for an equine industry representative.

(3) An employee of, or an individual who has a business or commercial relationship with, an individual described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(4) An immediate family member of an individual described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(f) FUNDING.—

(1) INITIAL FUNDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Initial funding to establish the Authority and underwrite its operations before the program effective date shall be provided by loans obtained by the Authority.

(B) BORROWING.—The Authority may borrow funds toward the funding of its operations.

(C) ANNUAL CALCULATION OF AMOUNTS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 90 days before the program effective date, and not later than November 1 each year thereafter, the Authority shall determine and provide to each State racing commission the estimated amount required from the State—

(I) to fund the State's proportionate share of the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program and the racetrack safety program for the next calendar year; and

(II) to liquidate the State's proportionate share of any loan or funding shortfall in the current calendar year and any previous calendar year.

(ii) BASIS OF CALCULATION.—The amounts calculated under clause (i) shall—

(I) be based on—

(aa) the annual budget of the Authority for the following calendar year, as approved by the Board; and

(bb) the projected amount of covered racing starts for the year in each State; and

(II) take into account other sources of Authority revenue.

(iii) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING BUDGETS OF AUTHORITY.—

(I) INITIAL BUDGET.—The initial budget of the Authority shall require the approval of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Board.

(II) SUBSEQUENT BUDGETS.—Any subsequent budget that exceeds the budget of the preceding calendar year by more than 5 percent shall require the approval of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Board.

(iv) RATE INCREASES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—A proposed increase in the amount required under this subparagraph shall be reported to the Commission.

(II) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register such a proposed increase and provide an opportunity for public comment.

(2) ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION OF FEES BY STATES.—

(A) NOTICE OF ELECTION.—Any State racing commission that elects to remit fees pursuant to this subsection shall notify the Authority of such election not later than 60 days before the program effective date.

(B) REQUIREMENT TO REMIT FEES.—After a State racing commission makes a notification under subparagraph (A), the election shall remain in effect and the State racing commission shall be required to remit fees pursuant to this subsection according to a schedule established in rule developed by the Authority and approved by the Commission.

(C) WITHDRAWAL OF ELECTION.—A State racing commission may cease remitting fees under this subsection not earlier than one year after notifying the Authority of the intent of the State racing commission to do so.

(D) DETERMINATION OF METHODS.—Each State racing commission shall determine, subject to the applicable laws, regulations, and contracts of the State, the method by which the requisite amount of fees, such as foal registration fees, sales contributions, starter fees, and track fees, and other fees on covered persons, shall be allocated, assessed, and collected.

(3) ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION OF FEES BY THE AUTHORITY.—

(A) CALCULATION.—If a State racing commission does not elect to remit fees pursuant to paragraph (2) or withdraws its election under such paragraph, the Authority shall, not less frequently than monthly, calculate the applicable fee per racing start multiplied by the number of racing starts in the State during the preceding month.

(B) ALLOCATION.—The Authority shall allocate equitably the amount calculated under subparagraph (A) collected among covered persons involved with covered horseraces pursuant to such rules as the Authority may promulgate.

(C) ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Authority shall assess a fee equal to the allocation made under subparagraph (B) and shall collect such fee according to such rules as the Authority may promulgate.

(ii) REMITTANCE OF FEES.—Covered persons described in subparagraph (B) shall be required to remit such fees to the Authority.

(D) LIMITATION.—A State racing commission that does not elect to remit fees pursuant to paragraph (2) or that withdraws its election under such paragraph shall not impose or collect from any person a fee or tax relating to anti-doping and medication control or racetrack safety matters for covered horseraces.

(4) FEES AND FINES.—Fees and fines imposed by the Authority shall be allocated toward funding of the Authority and its activities.

(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require—

(A) the appropriation of any amount to the Authority; or

(B) the Federal Government to guarantee the debts of the Authority.

(g) QUORUM.—For all items where Board approval is required, the Authority shall have present a majority of independent members.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION OVERSIGHT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Authority shall submit to the Commission, in accordance with such rules as the Commission may prescribe under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, any proposed rule, or proposed modification to a rule, of the Authority relating to—

(1) the bylaws of the Authority;

(2) a list of permitted and prohibited medications, substances, and methods, including

allowable limits of permitted medications, substances, and methods;

(3) laboratory standards for accreditation and protocols;

(4) standards for racing surface quality maintenance;

(5) racetrack safety standards and protocols;

(6) a program for injury and fatality data analysis;

(7) a program of research and education on safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control;

(8) a description of safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control rule violations applicable to covered horses and covered persons;

(9) a schedule of civil sanctions for violations;

(10) a process or procedures for disciplinary hearings; and

(11) a formula or methodology for determining assessments described in section 3(f).

(b) PUBLICATION AND COMMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall—

(A) publish in the Federal Register each proposed rule or modification submitted under subsection (a); and

(B) provide an opportunity for public comment.

(2) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—A proposed rule, or a proposed modification to a rule, of the Authority shall not take effect unless the proposed rule or modification has been approved by the Commission.

(c) DECISION ON PROPOSED RULE OR MODIFICATION TO A RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a proposed rule or modification is published in the Federal Register, the Commission shall approve or disapprove the proposed rule or modification.

(2) CONDITIONS.—The Commission shall approve a proposed rule or modification if the Commission finds that the proposed rule or modification is consistent with—

(A) this Act; and

(B) applicable rules approved by the Commission.

(3) REVISION OF PROPOSED RULE OR MODIFICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of disapproval of a proposed rule or modification under this subsection, not later than 30 days after the issuance of the disapproval, the Commission shall make recommendations to the Authority to modify the proposed rule or modification.

(B) RESUBMISSION.—The Authority may resubmit for approval by the Commission a proposed rule or modification that incorporates the modifications recommended under subparagraph (A).

(d) PROPOSED STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Authority shall submit to the Commission any proposed rule, standard, or procedure developed by the Authority to carry out the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program or the racetrack safety program.

(2) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register any such proposed rule, standard, or procedure and provide an opportunity for public comment.

(e) INTERIM FINAL RULES.—The Commission may adopt an interim final rule, to take effect immediately, under conditions specified in section 553(b)(B) of title 5, United States Code, if the Commission finds that such a rule is necessary to protect—

(1) the health and safety of covered horses; or

(2) the integrity of covered horseraces and wagering on those horseraces.

SEC. 5. JURISDICTION OF THE COMMISSION AND THE HORSERACING INTEGRITY AND SAFETY AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the program effective date, the Commission, the Authority, and the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency, each within the scope of their powers and responsibilities under this Act, as limited by subsection (j), shall—

(1) implement and enforce the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program and the racetrack safety program;

(2) exercise independent and exclusive national authority over—

(A) the safety, welfare, and integrity of covered horses, covered persons, and covered horseraces; and

(B) all horseracing safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control matters for covered horses, covered persons, and covered horseraces; and

(3) have safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control authority over covered persons similar to such authority of the State racing commissions before the program effective date.

(b) PREEMPTION.—The rules of the Authority promulgated in accordance with this Act shall preempt any provision of State law or regulation with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of the Authority under this Act, as limited by subsection (j). Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Authority—

(A) shall develop uniform procedures and rules authorizing—

(i) access to offices, racetrack facilities, other places of business, books, records, and personal property of covered persons that are used in the care, treatment, training, and racing of covered horses;

(ii) issuance and enforcement of subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum; and

(iii) other investigatory powers of the nature and scope exercised by State racing commissions before the program effective date; and

(B) with respect to an unfair or deceptive act or practice described in section 10, may recommend that the Commission commence an enforcement action.

(2) APPROVAL OF COMMISSION.—The procedures and rules developed under paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to approval by the Commission in accordance with section 4.

(d) REGISTRATION OF COVERED PERSONS WITH AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of participating in covered races and in the care, ownership, treatment, and training of covered horses, a covered person shall register with the Authority in accordance with rules promulgated by the Authority and approved by the Commission in accordance with section 4.

(2) AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO AUTHORITY RULES, STANDARDS, AND PROCEDURES.—Registration under this subsection shall include an agreement by the covered person to be subject to and comply with the rules, standards, and procedures developed and approved under subsection (c).

(3) COOPERATION.—A covered person registered under this subsection shall, at all times—

(A) cooperate with the Commission, the Authority, the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency, and any respective designee, during any civil investigation; and

(B) respond truthfully and completely to the best of the knowledge of the covered person if questioned by the Commission, the Authority, the anti-doping and medication con-

ty described by subparagraph (B) for such term as is provided by such rules and consistent with this Act.

(4) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—Any failure of a covered person to comply with this subsection shall be a violation of section 8(a)(2)(G).

(e) ENFORCEMENT OF PROGRAMS.—

(1) ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—

(A) AGREEMENT WITH USADA.—The Authority shall seek to enter into an agreement with the United States Anti-Doping Agency under which the Agency acts as the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency under this Act for services consistent with the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program.

(B) AGREEMENT WITH OTHER ENTITY.—If the Authority and the United States Anti-Doping Agency are unable to enter into the agreement described in subparagraph (A), the Authority shall enter into an agreement with an entity that is nationally recognized as being a medication regulation agency equal in qualification to the United States Anti-Doping Agency to act as the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency under this Act for services consistent with the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program.

(C) NEGOTIATIONS.—Any negotiations under this paragraph shall be conducted in good faith and designed to achieve efficient, effective best practices for anti-doping and medication control and enforcement on commercially reasonable terms.

(D) ELEMENTS OF AGREEMENT.—Any agreement under this paragraph shall include a description of the scope of work, performance metrics, reporting obligations, budgets of the United States Anti-Doping Agency while acting as the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency under this Act, a provision for the revision of the agreement to increase in the scope of work, as provided in subsection (k), and any other matter the Authority considers appropriate.

(E) DUTIES AND POWERS OF ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency under an agreement under this paragraph shall—

(i) serve as the independent anti-doping and medication control enforcement organization for covered horses, covered persons, and covered horseraces, implementing the anti-doping and medication control program on behalf of the Authority;

(ii) ensure that covered horses and covered persons are deterred from using or administering medications, substances, and methods in violation of the rules established in accordance with this Act;

(iii) implement anti-doping education, research, testing, compliance and adjudication programs designed to prevent covered persons and covered horses from using or administering medications, substances, and methods in violation of the rules established in accordance with this Act;

(iv) exercise the powers specified in section 6(c)(4) in accordance with that section; and

(v) implement and undertake any other responsibilities specified in the agreement.

(F) TERM AND EXTENSION.—

(i) TERM OF INITIAL AGREEMENT.—The initial agreement entered into by the Authority under this paragraph shall be in effect for the 5-year period beginning on the program effective date.

(ii) EXTENSION.—At the end of the 5-year period described in clause (i), the Authority may—

(I) extend the term of the initial agreement under this paragraph for such additional term as is provided by the rules of the Authority and consistent with this Act; or

(II) enter into an agreement meeting the requirements of this paragraph with an enti-

ty described by subparagraph (B) for such term as is provided by such rules and consistent with this Act.

(2) AGREEMENTS FOR ENFORCEMENT BY STATE RACING COMMISSIONS.—

(A) STATE RACING COMMISSIONS.—

(i) RACETRACK SAFETY PROGRAM.—The Authority may enter into agreements with State racing commissions for services consistent with the enforcement of the racetrack safety program.

(ii) ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL PROGRAM.—The anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency may enter into agreements with State racing commissions for services consistent with the enforcement of the anti-doping and medication control program.

(B) ELEMENTS OF AGREEMENTS.—Any agreement under this paragraph shall include a description of the scope of work, performance metrics, reporting obligations, budgets, and any other matter the Authority considers appropriate.

(3) ENFORCEMENT OF STANDARDS.—The Authority may coordinate with State racing commissions and other State regulatory agencies to monitor and enforce racetrack compliance with the standards developed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7(c).

(f) PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO RULES OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Recommendations for rules regarding anti-doping and medication control shall be developed in accordance with section 6.

(B) CONSULTATION.—The anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency shall consult with the anti-doping and medication control standing committee and the Board of the Authority on all anti-doping and medication control rules of the Authority.

(2) RACETRACK SAFETY.—Recommendations for rules regarding racetrack safety shall be developed by the racetrack safety standing committee of the Authority.

(g) SUBPOENA AND INVESTIGATORY AUTHORITY.—The Authority shall have subpoena and investigatory authority with respect to civil violations committed under its jurisdiction.

(h) CIVIL PENALTIES.—The Authority shall develop a list of civil penalties with respect to the enforcement of rules for covered persons and covered horseraces under its jurisdiction.

(i) CIVIL ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to civil sanctions imposed under section 8, the Authority may commence a civil action against a covered person or racetrack that has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage, in acts or practices constituting a violation of this Act or any rule established under this Act in the proper district court of the United States, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or the United States courts of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such acts or practices, to enforce any civil sanctions imposed under that section, and for all other relief to which the Authority may be entitled.

(2) INJUNCTIONS AND RESTRAINING ORDERS.—With respect to a civil action commenced under paragraph (1), upon a proper showing, a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond.

(j) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY.—

(1) PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION.—The jurisdiction and authority of the Authority and the Commission with respect to the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program and the racetrack safety program shall be prospective only.

(2) PREVIOUS MATTERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Authority and the Commission may not investigate, prosecute, adjudicate, or penalize conduct in violation of the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program and the racetrack safety program that occurs before the program effective date.

(B) STATE RACING COMMISSION.—With respect to conduct described in subparagraph (A), the applicable State racing commission shall retain authority until the final resolution of the matter.

(3) OTHER LAWS UNAFFECTED.—This Act shall not be construed to modify, impair, or restrict the operation of the general laws or regulations, as may be amended from time to time, of the United States, the States and their political subdivisions relating to criminal conduct, cruelty to animals, matters unrelated to anti-doping, medication control and racetrack and racing safety of covered horses and covered races, and the use of medication in human participants in covered races.

(k) ELECTION FOR OTHER BREED COVERAGE UNDER ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State racing commission or a breed governing organization for a breed of horses other than Thoroughbred horses may elect to have such breed be covered by this Act by the filing of a designated election form and subsequent approval by the Authority. A State racing commission may elect to have a breed covered by this Act for the applicable State only.

(2) ELECTION CONDITIONAL ON FUNDING MECHANISM.—A commission or organization may not make an election under paragraph (1) unless the commission or organization has in place a mechanism to provide sufficient funds to cover the costs of the administration of this Act with respect to the horses that will be covered by this Act as a result of the election.

(3) APPORTIONMENT.—The Authority shall apportion costs described in paragraph (2) in connection with an election under paragraph (1) fairly among all impacted segments of the horseracing industry, subject to approval by the Commission in accordance with section 4. Such apportionment may not provide for the allocation of costs or funds among breeds of horses.

SEC. 6. HORSERACING ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the program effective date, and after notice and an opportunity for public comment in accordance with section 4, the Authority shall establish a horseracing anti-doping and medication control program applicable to all covered horses, covered persons, and covered horseraces in accordance with the registration of covered persons under section 5(d).

(2) CONSIDERATION OF OTHER BREEDS.—In developing the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program with respect to a breed of horse that is made subject to this Act by election of a State racing commission or the breed governing organization for such horse under section 5(k), the Authority shall consider the unique characteristics of such breed.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM.—In developing the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program, the Authority shall take into consideration the following:

(1) Covered horses should compete only when they are free from the influence of medications, other foreign substances, and methods that affect their performance.

(2) Covered horses that are injured or unsound should not train or participate in covered races, and the use of medications, other foreign substances, and treatment methods that mask or deaden pain in order to allow

injured or unsound horses to train or race should be prohibited.

(3) Rules, standards, procedures, and protocols regulating medication and treatment methods for covered horses and covered races should be uniform and uniformly administered nationally.

(4) To the extent consistent with this Act, consideration should be given to international anti-doping and medication control standards of the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities and the Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics of the American Veterinary Medical Association.

(5) The administration of medications and treatment methods to covered horses should be based upon an examination and diagnosis that identifies an issue requiring treatment for which the medication or method represents an appropriate component of treatment.

(6) The amount of therapeutic medication that a covered horse receives should be the minimum necessary to address the diagnosed health concerns identified during the examination and diagnostic process.

(7) The welfare of covered horses, the integrity of the sport, and the confidence of the betting public require full disclosure to regulatory authorities regarding the administration of medications and treatments to covered horses.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—The following activities shall be carried out under the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program:

(1) STANDARDS FOR ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL.—Not later than 120 days before the program effective date, the Authority shall issue, by rule—

(A) uniform standards for—

(i) the administration of medication to covered horses by covered persons; and

(ii) laboratory testing accreditation and protocols; and

(B) a list of permitted and prohibited medications, substances, and methods, including allowable limits of permitted medications, substances, and methods.

(2) REVIEW PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF MEDICATION.—The development of a review process for the administration of any medication to a covered horse during the 48-hour period preceding the next racing start of the covered horse.

(3) AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS.—The development of requirements with respect to agreements under section 5(e).

(4) ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—

(A) CONTROL RULES, PROTOCOLS, ETC.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the anti-doping and medication control program enforcement agency under section 5(e) shall, in consultation with the anti-doping and medication control standing committee of the Authority and consistent with international best practices, develop and recommend anti-doping and medication control rules, protocols, policies, and guidelines for approval by the Authority.

(B) RESULTS MANAGEMENT.—The anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency shall conduct and oversee anti-doping and medication control results management, including independent investigations, charging and adjudication of potential medication control rule violations, and the enforcement of any civil sanctions for such violations. Any final decision or civil sanction of the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency under this subparagraph shall be the final decision or civil sanction of the Authority, subject to review in accordance with section 9.

(C) TESTING.—The anti-doping enforcement agency shall perform and manage test distribution planning (including intelligence-based testing), the sample collection process,

and in-competition and out-of-competition testing (including no-advance-notice testing).

(D) TESTING LABORATORIES.—The anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency shall accredit testing laboratories based upon the standards established under this Act, and shall monitor, test, and audit accredited laboratories to ensure continuing compliance with accreditation standards.

(5) ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL STANDING COMMITTEE.—The anti-doping and medication control standing committee shall, in consultation with the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency, develop lists of permitted and prohibited medications, methods, and substances for recommendation to, and approval by, the Authority. Any such list may prohibit the administration of any substance or method to a horse at any time after such horse becomes a covered horse if the Authority determines such substance or method has a long-term degrading effect on the soundness of a horse.

(d) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsections (e) and (f), the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program shall prohibit the administration of any prohibited or otherwise permitted substance to a covered horse within 48 hours of its next racing start, effective as of the program effective date.

(e) ADVISORY COMMITTEE STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the program effective date, the Authority shall convene an advisory committee comprised of horseracing anti-doping and medication control industry experts, including a member designated by the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency, to conduct a study on the use of furosemide on horses during the 48-hour period before the start of a race, including the effect of furosemide on equine health and the integrity of competition and any other matter the Authority considers appropriate.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than three years after the program effective date, the Authority shall direct the advisory committee convened under paragraph (1) to submit to the Authority a written report on the study conducted under that paragraph that includes recommended changes, if any, to the prohibition in subsection (d).

(3) MODIFICATION OF PROHIBITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After receipt of the report required by paragraph (2), the Authority may, by unanimous vote of the Board of the Authority, modify the prohibition in subsection (d) and, notwithstanding subsection (f), any such modification shall apply to all States beginning on the date that is three years after the program effective date.

(B) CONDITION.—In order for a unanimous vote described in subparagraph (A) to effect a modification of the prohibition in subsection (d), the vote must include unanimous adoption of each of the following findings:

(i) That the modification is warranted.

(ii) That the modification is in the best interests of horse racing.

(iii) That furosemide has no performance enhancing effect on individual horses.

(iv) That public confidence in the integrity and safety of racing would not be adversely affected by the modification.

(f) EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), only during the three-year period beginning on the program effective date, a State racing commission may submit to the Authority, at such time and in such manner as the Authority may require, a request for an exemption from the prohibition in subsection (d) with respect to the use of

furosemide on covered horses during such period.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—An exemption under paragraph (1) may not be requested for—

(A) two-year-old covered horses; or

(B) covered horses competing in stakes races.

(3) CONTENTS OF REQUEST.—A request under paragraph (1) shall specify the applicable State racing commission's requested limitations on the use of furosemide that would apply to the State under the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program during such period. Such limitations shall be no less restrictive on the use and administration of furosemide than the restrictions set forth in State's laws and regulations in effect as of September 1, 2020.

(4) GRANT OF EXEMPTION.—Subject to subsection (e)(3), the Authority shall grant an exemption requested under paragraph (1) for the remainder of such period and shall allow the use of furosemide on covered horses in the applicable State, in accordance with the requested limitations.

(g) BASELINE ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the baseline anti-doping and medication control rules described in paragraph (2) shall—

(A) constitute the initial rules of the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program; and

(B) except as exempted pursuant to subsections (e) and (f), remain in effect at all times after the program effective date.

(2) BASELINE ANTI-DOPING MEDICATION CONTROL RULES DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The baseline anti-doping and medication control rules described in this paragraph are the following:

(i) The lists of permitted and prohibited substances (including drugs, medications, and naturally occurring substances and synthetically occurring substances) in effect for the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities, including the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities International Screening Limits for urine, dated May 2019, and the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities International Screening Limits for plasma, dated May 2019.

(ii) The World Anti-Doping Agency International Standard for Laboratories (version 10.0), dated November 12, 2019.

(iii) The Association of Racing Commissioners International out-of-competition testing standards, Model Rules of Racing (version 9.2).

(iv) The Association of Racing Commissioners International penalty and multiple medication violation rules, Model Rules of Racing (version 6.2).

(B) CONFLICT OF RULES.—In the case of a conflict among the rules described in subparagraph (A), the most stringent rule shall apply.

(3) MODIFICATIONS TO BASELINE RULES.—

(A) DEVELOPMENT BY ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL STANDING COMMITTEE.—The anti-doping and medication control standing committee, in consultation with the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency, may develop and submit to the Authority for approval by the Authority proposed modifications to the baseline anti-doping and medication control rules.

(B) AUTHORITY APPROVAL.—If the Authority approves a proposed modification under this paragraph, the proposed modification shall be submitted to and considered by the Commission in accordance with section 4.

(C) ANTI-DOPING AND MEDICATION CONTROL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY VETO AUTHORITY.—The Authority shall not approve any proposed modification that renders an anti-doping and medication control rule less stringent than the baseline anti-doping and medication con-

trol rules described in paragraph (2) (including by increasing permitted medication thresholds, adding permitted medications, removing prohibited medications, or weakening enforcement mechanisms) without the approval of the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency.

SEC. 7. RACETRACK SAFETY PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND CONSIDERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the program effective date, and after notice and an opportunity for public comment in accordance with section 4, the Authority shall establish a racetrack safety program applicable to all covered horses, covered persons, and covered horseraces in accordance with the registration of covered persons under section 5(d).

(2) CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT OF SAFETY PROGRAM.—In the development of the horseracing safety program for covered horses, covered persons, and covered horseraces, the Authority and the Commission shall take into consideration existing safety standards including the National Thoroughbred Racing Association Safety and Integrity Alliance Code of Standards, the International Federation of Horseracing Authority's International Agreement on Breeding, Racing, and Wagering, and the British Horseracing Authority's Equine Health and Welfare program.

(b) ELEMENTS OF HORSERACING SAFETY PROGRAM.—The horseracing safety program shall include the following:

(1) A set of training and racing safety standards and protocols taking into account regional differences and the character of differing racing facilities.

(2) A uniform set of training and racing safety standards and protocols consistent with the humane treatment of covered horses, which may include lists of permitted and prohibited practices or methods (such as crop use).

(3) A racing surface quality maintenance system that—

(A) takes into account regional differences and the character of differing racing facilities; and

(B) may include requirements for track surface design and consistency and established standard operating procedures related to track surface, monitoring, and maintenance (such as standardized seasonal assessment, daily tracking, and measurement).

(4) A uniform set of track safety standards and protocols, that may include rules governing oversight and movement of covered horses and human and equine injury reporting and prevention.

(5) Programs for injury and fatality data analysis, that may include pre- and post-training and race inspections, use of a veterinarian's list, and concussion protocols.

(6) The undertaking of investigations at racetrack and non-racetrack facilities related to safety violations.

(7) Procedures for investigating, charging, and adjudicating violations and for the enforcement of civil sanctions for violations.

(8) A schedule of civil sanctions for violations.

(9) Disciplinary hearings, which may include binding arbitration, civil sanctions, and research.

(10) Management of violation results.

(11) Programs relating to safety and performance research and education.

(12) An evaluation and accreditation program that ensures that racetracks in the United States meet the standards described in the elements of the Horseracing Safety Program.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—The following activities shall be carried out under the racetrack safety program:

(1) STANDARDS FOR RACETRACK SAFETY.—The development, by the racetrack safety standing committee of the Authority in section 3(c)(2) of uniform standards for racetrack and horseracing safety.

(2) STANDARDS FOR SAFETY AND PERFORMANCE ACCREDITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days before the program effective date, the Authority, in consultation with the racetrack safety standing committee, shall issue, by rule in accordance with section 4—

(i) safety and performance standards of accreditation for racetracks; and

(ii) the process by which a racetrack may achieve and maintain accreditation by the Authority.

(B) MODIFICATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Authority may modify rules establishing the standards issued under subparagraph (A), as the Authority considers appropriate.

(ii) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register any proposed rule of the Authority, and provide an opportunity for public comment with respect to, any modification under clause (i) in accordance with section 4.

(C) EXTENSION OF PROVISIONAL OR INTERIM ACCREDITATION.—The Authority may, by rule in accordance with section 4, extend provisional or interim accreditation to a racetrack accredited by the National Thoroughbred Racing Association Safety and Integrity Alliance on a date before the program effective date.

(3) NATIONWIDE SAFETY AND PERFORMANCE DATABASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the program effective date, and after notice and an opportunity for public comment in accordance with section 4, the Authority, in consultation with the Commission, shall develop and maintain a nationwide database of racehorse safety, performance, health, and injury information for the purpose of conducting an epidemiological study.

(B) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—In accordance with the registration of covered persons under section 5(d), the Authority may require covered persons to collect and submit to the database described in subparagraph (A) such information as the Authority may require to further the goal of increased racehorse welfare.

SEC. 8. RULE VIOLATIONS AND CIVIL SANCTIONS.

(a) DESCRIPTION OF RULE VIOLATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Authority shall issue, by rule in accordance with section 4, a description of safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control rule violations applicable to covered horses and covered persons.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The description of rule violations established under paragraph (1) may include the following:

(A) With respect to a covered horse, strict liability for covered trainers for—

(i) the presence of a prohibited substance or method in a sample or the use of a prohibited substance or method;

(ii) the presence of a permitted substance in a sample in excess of the amount allowed by the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program; and

(iii) the use of a permitted method in violation of the applicable limitations established under the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program.

(B) Attempted use of a prohibited substance or method on a covered horse.

(C) Possession of any prohibited substance or method.

(D) Attempted possession of any prohibited substance or method.

(E) Administration or attempted administration of any prohibited substance or method on a covered horse.

(F) Refusal or failure, without compelling justification, to submit a covered horse for sample collection.

(G) Failure to cooperate with the Authority or an agent of the Authority during any investigation.

(H) Failure to respond truthfully, to the best of a covered person's knowledge, to a question of the Authority or an agent of the Authority with respect to any matter under the jurisdiction of the Authority.

(I) Tampering or attempted tampering with the application of the safety, performance, or anti-doping and medication control rules or process adopted by the Authority, including—

(i) the intentional interference, or an attempt to interfere, with an official or agent of the Authority;

(ii) the procurement or the provision of fraudulent information to the Authority or agent; and

(iii) the intimidation of, or an attempt to intimidate, a potential witness.

(J) Trafficking or attempted trafficking in any prohibited substance or method.

(K) Assisting, encouraging, aiding, abetting, conspiring, covering up, or any other type of intentional complicity involving a safety, performance, or anti-doping and medication control rule violation or the violation of a period of suspension or eligibility.

(L) Threatening or seeking to intimidate a person with the intent of discouraging the person from the good faith reporting to the Authority, an agent of the Authority or the Commission, or the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency under section 5(e), of information that relates to—

(i) an alleged safety, performance, or anti-doping and medication control rule violation; or

(ii) alleged noncompliance with a safety, performance, or anti-doping and medication control rule.

(b) TESTING LABORATORIES.—

(1) ACCREDITATION AND STANDARDS.—Not later than 120 days before the program effective date, the Authority shall, in consultation with the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency, establish, by rule in accordance with section 4—

(A) standards of accreditation for laboratories involved in testing samples from covered horses;

(B) the process for achieving and maintaining accreditation; and

(C) the standards and protocols for testing such samples.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The accreditation of laboratories and the conduct of audits of accredited laboratories to ensure compliance with Authority rules shall be administered by the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency. The anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency shall have the authority to require specific test samples to be directed to and tested by laboratories having special expertise in the required tests.

(3) EXTENSION OF PROVISIONAL OR INTERIM ACCREDITATION.—The Authority may, by rule in accordance with section 4, extend provisional or interim accreditation to a laboratory accredited by the Racing Medication and Testing Consortium, Inc., on a date before the program effective date.

(4) SELECTION OF LABORATORIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a State racing commission may select a laboratory accredited in accordance with the standards established under paragraph (1) to test samples taken in the applicable State.

(B) SELECTION BY THE AUTHORITY.—If a State racing commission does not select an accredited laboratory under subparagraph (A), the Authority shall select such a laboratory to test samples taken in the State concerned.

(C) RESULTS MANAGEMENT AND DISCIPLINARY PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days before the program effective date, the Authority shall establish in accordance with section 4—

(A) rules for safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control results management; and

(B) the disciplinary process for safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control rule violations.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The rules and process established under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Provisions for notification of safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control rule violations.

(B) Hearing procedures.

(C) Standards for burden of proof.

(D) Presumptions.

(E) Evidentiary rules.

(F) Appeals.

(G) Guidelines for confidentiality and public reporting of decisions.

(3) DUE PROCESS.—The rules established under paragraph (1) shall provide for adequate due process, including impartial hearing officers or tribunals commensurate with the seriousness of the alleged safety, performance, or anti-doping and medication control rule violation and the possible civil sanctions for such violation.

(d) CIVIL SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Authority shall establish uniform rules, in accordance with section 4, imposing civil sanctions against covered persons or covered horses for safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control rule violations.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The rules established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) take into account the unique aspects of horseracing;

(B) be designed to ensure fair and transparent horseraces; and

(C) deter safety, performance, and anti-doping and medication control rule violations.

(3) SEVERITY.—The civil sanctions under paragraph (1) may include—

(A) lifetime bans from horseracing, disbursement of purses, monetary fines and penalties, and changes to the order of finish in covered races; and

(B) with respect to anti-doping and medication control rule violators, an opportunity to reduce the applicable civil sanctions that is comparable to the opportunity provided by the Protocol for Olympic Movement Testing of the United States Anti-Doping Agency.

(e) MODIFICATIONS.—The Authority may propose a modification to any rule established under this section as the Authority considers appropriate, and the proposed modification shall be submitted to and considered by the Commission in accordance with section 4.

SEC. 9. REVIEW OF FINAL DECISIONS OF THE AUTHORITY.

(a) NOTICE OF CIVIL SANCTIONS.—If the Authority imposes a final civil sanction for a violation committed by a covered person pursuant to the rules or standards of the Authority, the Authority shall promptly submit to the Commission notice of the civil sanction in such form as the Commission may require.

(b) REVIEW BY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a final civil sanction imposed by the Authority, on

application by the Commission or a person aggrieved by the civil sanction filed not later than 30 days after the date on which notice under subsection (a) is submitted, the civil sanction shall be subject to de novo review by an administrative law judge.

(2) NATURE OF REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In matters reviewed under this subsection, the administrative law judge shall determine whether—

(i) a person has engaged in such acts or practices, or has omitted such acts or practices, as the Authority has found the person to have engaged in or omitted;

(ii) such acts, practices, or omissions are in violation of this Act or the anti-doping and medication control or racetrack safety rules approved by the Commission; or

(iii) the final civil sanction of the Authority was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.

(B) CONDUCT OF HEARING.—An administrative law judge shall conduct a hearing under this subsection in such a manner as the Commission may specify by rule, which shall conform to section 556 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) DECISION BY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a matter reviewed under this subsection, an administrative law judge—

(i) shall render a decision not later than 60 days after the conclusion of the hearing;

(ii) may affirm, reverse, modify, set aside, or remand for further proceedings, in whole or in part, the final civil sanction of the Authority; and

(iii) may make any finding or conclusion that, in the judgment of the administrative law judge, is proper and based on the record.

(B) FINAL DECISION.—A decision under this paragraph shall constitute the decision of the Commission without further proceedings unless a notice or an application for review is timely filed under subsection (c).

(c) REVIEW BY COMMISSION.—

(1) NOTICE OF REVIEW BY COMMISSION.—The Commission may, on its own motion, review any decision of an administrative law judge issued under subsection (b)(3) by providing written notice to the Authority and any interested party not later than 30 days after the date on which the administrative law judge issues the decision.

(2) APPLICATION FOR REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Authority or a person aggrieved by a decision issued under subsection (b)(3) may petition the Commission for review of such decision by filing an application for review not later than 30 days after the date on which the administrative law judge issues the decision.

(B) EFFECT OF DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR REVIEW.—If an application for review under subparagraph (A) is denied, the decision of the administrative law judge shall constitute the decision of the Commission without further proceedings.

(C) DISCRETION OF COMMISSION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A decision with respect to whether to grant an application for review under subparagraph (A) is subject to the discretion of the Commission.

(ii) MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED.—In determining whether to grant such an application for review, the Commission shall consider whether the application makes a reasonable showing that—

(I) a prejudicial error was committed in the conduct of the proceeding; or

(II) the decision involved—

(aa) an erroneous application of the anti-doping and medication control or racetrack safety rules approved by the Commission; or

(bb) an exercise of discretion or a decision of law or policy that warrants review by the Commission.

(3) NATURE OF REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In matters reviewed under this subsection, the Commission may—

(i) affirm, reverse, modify, set aside, or remand for further proceedings, in whole or in part, the decision of the administrative law judge; and

(ii) make any finding or conclusion that, in the judgement of the Commission, is proper and based on the record.

(B) DE NOVO REVIEW.—The Commission shall review de novo the factual findings and conclusions of law made by the administrative law judge.

(C) CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE.—

(i) MOTION BY COMMISSION.—The Commission may, on its own motion, allow the consideration of additional evidence.

(ii) MOTION BY A PARTY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—A party may file a motion to consider additional evidence at any time before the issuance of a decision by the Commission, which shall show, with particularity, that—

(aa) such additional evidence is material; and

(bb) there were reasonable grounds for failure to submit the evidence previously.

(II) PROCEDURE.—The Commission may—

(aa) accept or hear additional evidence; or

(bb) remand the proceeding to the administrative law judge for the consideration of additional evidence.

(d) STAY OF PROCEEDINGS.—Review by an administrative law judge or the Commission under this section shall not operate as a stay of a final civil sanction of the Authority unless the administrative law judge or Commission orders such a stay.

SEC. 10. UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.

The sale of a covered horse, or of any other horse in anticipation of its future participation in a covered race, shall be considered an unfair or deceptive act or practice in or affecting commerce under section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)) if the seller—

(1) knows or has reason to know the horse has been administered—

(A) a bisphosphonate prior to the horse's fourth birthday; or

(B) any other substance or method the Authority determines has a long-term degrading effect on the soundness of the covered horse; and

(2) fails to disclose to the buyer the administration of the bisphosphonate or other substance or method described in paragraph (1)(B).

SEC. 11. STATE DELEGATION; COOPERATION.

(a) STATE DELEGATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Authority may enter into an agreement with a State racing commission to implement, within the jurisdiction of the State racing commission, a component of the racetrack safety program or, with the concurrence of the anti-doping and medication control enforcement agency under section 5(e), a component of the horseracing anti-doping and medication control program, if the Authority determines that the State racing commission has the ability to implement such component in accordance with the rules, standards, and requirements established by the Authority.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION BY STATE RACING COMMISSION.—A State racing commission or other appropriate regulatory body of a State may not implement such a component in a manner less restrictive than the rule, standard, or requirement established by the Authority.

(b) COOPERATION.—To avoid duplication of functions, facilities, and personnel, and to attain closer coordination and greater effectiveness and economy in administration of Federal and State law, where conduct by any person subject to the horseracing medication control program or the racetrack safety program may involve both a medication control or racetrack safety rule violation and violation of Federal or State law, the Authority and Federal or State law enforcement authorities shall cooperate and share information.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. COONS):

S. 4549. A bill to give Federal courts additional discretion to determine whether pretrial detention is appropriate for defendants charged with non-violent drug offenses in Federal criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 4549

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Smarter Pretrial Detention for Drug Charges Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. RELEASE CONDITIONS AND DETENTION IN FEDERAL CRIMINAL CASES.

Section 3142 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(42 U.S.C. 14135a)” each place it appears and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 40702)”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(3)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), respectively.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 4554. A bill to provide compensation for United States victims of Libyan state sponsored terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Justice for the Living Victims of Lockerbie Act. This bill would create a process to seek justice for a group Pan American World Airways pilots who lost their careers and pensions following the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, and the subsequent bankruptcy and closure of Pan Am.

On December 21, 1988, the state of Libya committed an infamous act of terror by bombing Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 270 innocent civilians. Despite Pan Am's greatly improved financial position in 1988, the media coverage of the terrorist attack wreaked havoc on Pan Am sales leading to its bankruptcy in 1991.

In 2008, the United States entered into the U.S.-Libya Humanitarian Settlement Agreement, in which Libya paid \$1.5 billion to settle claims by U.S. citizens for Libyan-sponsored terrorism.

After payments by the State Department to families of death victims from Lockerbie and the La Belle Disco bombing in Germany, compensation to other victims was to be determined by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The Commission could only consider further claims referred to it by the State Department.

One of these claimants was a group of senior Pan Am pilots, most of whom were veterans, who were over the age of 50 and lost their jobs, pensions, healthcare, and eventually their savings when Pan Am went bankrupt and closed. Due to the federally required retirement age of 60 at that time, and the airline industry's seniority system, they were unable to get new pilot jobs with other airlines. Two of these pilots reside in Maine—Ron Fitch of Poland Spring and Schafer Bean of Diamond Cove—and I have heard their stories and their pleas for Justice on behalf of their own families and the others who suffered as a result of Libya's acts of terrorism.

This group's initial lawsuit against Libya, which had been joined with the families of those who died at Lockerbie, was dismissed by the courts due to sovereign immunity. Following the 2008 settlement agreement with Libya, the group of pilots approached the State Department in 2009 seeking the necessary referral to have their claims heard by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. For more than 4 years the State Department failed to refer the group's claims to the Commission, but following bipartisan letters to then-Secretaries Clinton and Kerry signed by myself and more than 60 other Members of Congress, the State Department finally referred the claims in 2013.

After an initial denial of claims in a preliminary ruling by the Commission in July 2016, the group of pilots was granted a hearing in December 2016. So many of the pilots and their families attended the hearing that it was moved to a U.S. District Court courtroom in Washington, DC. Three senior Pan Am executives testified at the hearing, including the former Pan Am CEO, Thomas Plaskett; former Pan Am senior vice president for finance, Ramesh Punwani; and former Pan Am vice president of strategic planning, Peter Pappas. Each explained why the Lockerbie bombing and the subsequent media coverage directly caused the airline's collapse.

In January 2018, more than a year following that hearing, the Commission ruled against the pilots. Using an undefined standard of proof and applying international law, the Commission argued that Pan Am's demise was not caused by the Lockerbie bombing, contrary to the testimony of the former Pan Am executives themselves. The pilots' referred claim was the very last of the Libyan claims adjudicated by the Commission, and the Libya settlement fund is now exhausted from the claims it approved prior to the final adjudication of the pilots' claims.

These terrorism victims were denied an opportunity to even make their case for 4 years by the Department of State, and when finally referred to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, they were forced to wait another 3 years for a preliminary ruling and another 2 years for a final decision, by which point the Commission had already awarded claims that essentially exhausted the settlement funds provided by Libya. That simply is not fair, and I believe these Mainers and other Americans deserve a quick and fair process to compensate them for their losses.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working toward justice for all of the victims of the Lockerbie bombing perpetrated by Libya.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 685—HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS AND CONDEMNING THE DISGRACEFUL DENIGRATION BY PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP OF MILITARY SERVICE, PRISONERS OF WAR, AND GOLD STAR FAMILIES

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 685

Whereas the Nation owes an unmeasurable debt to all those individuals who have served in the United States Armed Forces, often shouldering the burden of long periods away from home, difficult and frequently dangerous training and deployments, and inherent physical, mental, and emotional risks;

Whereas the families, communities, and loved ones of members of the Armed Forces support them in countless ways, frequently making sacrifices of their own, especially Gold Star families;

Whereas many who love this country have served in conflicts throughout the Nation's history, whether volunteering so another would not have to go or answering the call when drafted, or out of a profound and selfless sense of duty, some never returning home, some still missing, and some who suffered immense hardship as prisoners of war;

Whereas one of the highest honors and solemn responsibilities of serving as President of the United States is to be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces;

Whereas faithful execution of this constitutional duty requires, at a minimum,

that the Commander in Chief forcefully defend the safety of members of the Armed Forces against foreign adversaries, such as President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin;

Whereas the Commander in Chief has a duty to uphold good order and discipline in the Armed Forces by refusing to issue unconstitutional orders, refusing to pardon and excuse those in uniform who commit crimes, and refusing to use rhetoric that seeks to divide military personnel from their senior leaders;

Whereas the Nation honors the service and sacrifice of members of the Armed Forces and veterans who placed the mission first and refused to leave a fallen comrade, never asking what was in it for them, but, rather, setting aside selfish interests in defense of the Nation;

Whereas a lack of respect for individuals who served in uniform is a disqualifying characteristic for service as President;

Whereas President Trump repeatedly disrespected members of the Armed Forces, and demonstrated a fundamental ignorance of the ethos of military service—

(1) when President Trump dehumanized members in saying of such members that “[w]e train our boys to be killing machines, then prosecute them when they kill!”;

(2) when President Trump pardoned members convicted of actions that violate the laws of war, thereby valorizing war crimes and contempt for the rule of law and unethical warfighting, and undermining good order and discipline;

(3) when President Trump dismissed traumatic brain injury as “headaches” and described an incident of members suffering traumatic brain injuries as a result of missile strikes as “not very serious”;

(4) when President Trump denigrated the military service of the late Senator John McCain by claiming that “[h]e’s not a war hero. He’s a war hero because he was captured. I like people who weren’t captured”;

(5) when President Trump failed to speak of Gold Star parents with honor and respect;

(6) when President Trump sought to humiliate a decorated military officer, who was awarded the Purple Heart, by forcing White House security to escort the officer off the property when removing him from the National Security Council; and

(7) when President Trump failed to honor the solemn responsibility of the Commander in Chief to offer comfort to the families of members killed in action on his watch; and

Whereas President Trump has failed to publicly condemn, warn, or even criticize President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, following public reports that Russia offered bounties for the killing of members of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the denigration by President Donald Trump of members of the United States Armed Forces and veterans;

(2) affirms that the service and sacrifice of individuals who serve the Nation in uniform, refuse to leave a fallen comrade behind and never retreat in the face of grave danger, as exemplified by the United States Marines who demonstrated bravery, grit, and valor in prevailing in the fierce Battle of Belleau Wood during World War I, reflect the true character of our country that makes America great;

(3) will honor and never forget the sacrifices and bravery of members of the Armed Forces who became prisoners of war or went missing in action;

(4) will respect, honor, and care for the service-disabled veterans who have borne the battle in defense of the Nation, recognizing that wounds of war are earned by those who set aside selfish interests; and

(5) demands that President Donald Trump uphold his oath of office and constitutional duty as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to defend members of the Armed Forces against hostile actions by leaders and military forces of the Russian Federation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 686—HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES, VETERANS, PRISONERS OF WAR, AND GOLD STAR FAMILIES

Mrs. LOEFFLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 686

Whereas the Nation owes an unmeasurable debt to those individuals who have served in the United States Armed Forces, often shouldering the burden of long periods away from home, difficult and frequently dangerous training and deployments, and inherent physical, mental, and emotional risks;

Whereas the families, communities, and loved ones of members of the Armed Forces support them in countless ways, frequently making sacrifices of their own, especially Gold Star families;

Whereas many who love this country have served in conflicts throughout the Nation's history, whether volunteering so another would not have to go or answering the call when drafted, or out of a profound and selfless sense of duty, some never returning home, some still missing, and some who suffered immense hardship as prisoners of war;

Whereas the Armed Forces defend the Nation against external threats, underpin the increasing safety, security, and prosperity created by a United States-led international order, and constantly contribute to the daily lives of Americans;

Whereas it is a constitutional duty of the first order for the President and the Senate to provide for America's common defense, foremost by supporting our unique All-Volunteer Force and their families;

Whereas the President has requested, and the Senate has voted for, 3 consecutive pay raises for members of the Armed Forces after several years of shrinking military salaries;

Whereas the Senate has passed, and the President has signed into law, landmark military private housing reform to protect military families in their homes;

Whereas the Senate has passed, and the President has signed into law, a historic repeal of the Widow's Tax to recognize the tremendous burden borne by the families of those who made the ultimate sacrifice;

Whereas the Senate has passed, and the President has signed into law, significant improvements to military spouse licensing to vastly increase opportunities for military spouses and strengthen military families;

Whereas the Senate has passed, and the President has signed into law, repeated expansions of military childcare and improvements to the military moving process;

Whereas the Senate has passed, and the President has signed into law, honorary promotions for members of the Armed Forces who served heroically in World War II, Vietnam, and Afghanistan, as well as instituted reviews of valor medals for personnel who served in World War I;

Whereas the Senate has passed, and the President has signed into law, billions of dollars of support for United States allies and partners, including lethal assistance to Ukraine against the aggression of the Russian Federation;

Whereas the Senate has passed, and the President has signed into law, defense budgets that reverse the destructive effects of sequestration, restore the readiness of our combat forces, and give members of the Armed Forces the tools they need to defend America;

Whereas the President authorized the successful military operation on January 3, 2020, that killed Qasem Soleimani of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps of Iran, who was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of members of the Armed Forces and civilians;

Whereas the President authorized the successful military operation on October 26, 2019, that killed Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, who was responsible for direct attacks on members of the Armed Forces and the death or displacement of untold numbers of Iraqis, Syrians, and Kurds;

Whereas the President authorized the successful military operation on February 7, 2018, against Russian military contractors in Syria that threatened the Armed Forces and aided and abetted the murderous regime of Bashar al-Assad; and

Whereas the President was nominated for the 2021 Nobel Peace Prize for his successful efforts to create peace between Israel and the United Arab Emirates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) will always honor and venerate the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces who put the security and safety of the American people ahead of their own self-interest, from those who served in World Wars I and II, Korea, to Vietnam, from the Gulf War and the Balkan conflicts to Iraq and Afghanistan, and from the frontlines of deterring China and Russia and combating terrorism to supporting American communities here at home when natural disasters strike;

(2) continues to advocate for resources to ensure the Armed Forces will maintain its position as the dominant force for freedom and prosperity in the world; and

(3) expresses the deepest gratitude to the Gold Star families who have suffered the loss of their loved ones in service to the Nation.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 9, 2020, at 10 a.m. in open session for a hearing entitled "The Status of the Federal Reserve Emergency Lending Facilities."

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 9, 2020, at 10 a.m., in room 106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Successful State Stewardship: A legislative hearing to examine S. 614, the Grizzly Bear State Management Act."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 9, 2020 at 11 a.m., to hold a classified briefing titled "Update on Eastern Europe."

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, September 9, 2020, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in order to conduct a hearing entitled "Vaccines: Saving Lives, Ensuring Confidence, and Protecting Public Health."

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, September 9, at 3:30 p.m. in order to conduct a hearing on the nominations of John Gibbs to be Director, Office of Personnel Management, and the Honorable John M. Barger, the Honorable Christopher B. Burnham, and Frank Dunlevy to be Members, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 9, 2020, at 10 a.m. in room 226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 9, 2020, at 3:30 p.m. in SD-106 to conduct a hearing titled "S. 785: Leading the Way to Comprehensive Mental Health Care and Suicide Prevention for Veterans."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 9, 2020, from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. in room SD-G50 in the Dirksen Senate Office Building to hold an open hearing on "Declassification Policy and Prospects for Reform."

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2020

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

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GARDNER. 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 7:41 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 10, 2020, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 9, 2020:

THE JUDICIARY

BRETT H. LUDWIG, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN.

CHRISTY CRISWELL WIEGAND, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.