

happened on COVID 3. It happened on COVID 3.5. I pray and plead, for the sake of our country and the people who are suffering, that it will happen again and that Republicans, once they see they can't pass this emaciated, terribly insufficient, and poison-pill-pocked proposal, will start negotiating in reality with us—something they have not done as of yet.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Madam President, now on President Trump, yesterday it was reported that, in taped interviews with Bob Woodward, President Trump acknowledged that he knew the danger posed by COVID-19 way back in February but he deliberately—deliberately—downplayed the threat to the American people. We now know that the President wasn't ill-informed. He wasn't being overly optimistic. He was lying to the American people. He was deliberately downplaying the virus to the American people at a time when early and forceful action could have saved so many lives.

Look, when the house is on fire—a five-alarm fire—you have an obligation to let people know. If you don't, they are going to burn, and they are going to die.

When we look at the rest of the world and see why they are doing better than we are in fighting this disease, the reason is simple: They had some leadership. We have had none from the White House—none. We have had lying. We have had ignoring the problem. We have had misleading the American people but no leadership at a time when we desperately need it.

Other leaders around the world were clear about science. They faced up to the problem and worked hard to solve it. They instituted policies to test, trace, and isolate. We had a President who simply lied about the dangers of the disease and suggested that Americans inject bleach. Other leaders took responsibility and ownership. We had a President who said: "It is what it is." In the annals of history, this will be one of the five greatest examples of lack of leadership in American history.

President Trump, the history books are not going to regard you kindly. They are not going to regard you kindly.

The President is coming up with great excuses now for his perfidious lies. This time, he said he didn't want to tell the truth about COVID because it might cause panic. Really? Is this the same President who is busy panicking America right now, telling women in the suburbs that their safety is at risk when the suburbs are not at risk at all? Is this the same President who invented a caravan of migrants in an attempt to panic Americans before the last election? This President always uses panic as a tool when he thinks it serves his interest, so the idea that he did it because he didn't want to panic Americans does not ring true. It seems like an *ex post facto* excuse for the President's perfidious lies.

President Trump doesn't mind panicking people when it serves his interest. What is worse is that he will not tell the truth when it hurts his interest, even if lives are at stake.

The President's comments in this interview were despicable. It should serve as a warning to all Americans about who this man is and his total, complete abject failure to lead.

(Mr. SCOTT of Florida assumed the Chair.)

TRANSIT

Mr. President, finally, on transit, COVID-19 has changed nearly every aspect of American life, but Senate Republicans and the White House only want to address the barest sliver of the problems in our country, so this week I have been pointing out many of the things that the Republican proposal leaves out.

Yesterday, I spoke about the plight of live venues and the need to save that essential part of our culture and our economy. Today I want to address another topic that has received far too little attention from the Senate Republicans: transit.

Public transportation systems are the lifeblood of great American cities. Regional networks connect workers to jobs and consumers and businesses. As anyone can imagine, during the pandemic, while transit authorities like the MTA have continued round-the-clock operations to serve the people, ridership on public transportation has plummeted, leaving them in a state of crisis. God forbid if public transportation were forced to shutter or drastically reduce operations, like on Long Island, where they rely on the Long Island Rail Road. The damage to regional economies and to the national economy would be severe. But there is not a penny—not one single penny—in the Republican bill to help public transit systems or even help State and local governments, which fund a lot of the transit systems—not a penny.

My Republican friends seem to look at this crisis through a narrow lens. Some of my colleagues have criticized Democrats for the outrageous idea of wanting to help our State governments and the essential public services they provide.

I have news for our colleagues. These regional transit systems are mission critical to the national economy. It is not just a New York problem or a New Jersey problem or an Illinois problem, it is a national crisis.

The Metropolitan Transit Authority alone carries about 40 percent of the Nation's transit riders and drives as much as 10 percent of the national GDP—10 percent. The facts argue for heavy investment in public transportation systems to stanch the bleeding and jump-start the economy when the pandemic wanes. The lack of investment in transit systems in the Republican legislation is unacceptable.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. President, finally, according to a whistleblower complaint filed by a

former senior official in the Office of Intelligence and Analysis at the Department of Homeland Security, political leaders at DHS told him to refrain from sharing reports about Putin's efforts to interfere with our elections because "they make the President look bad." And this DHS whistleblower goes on to allege a broader pattern by Trump and his lieutenants of politicizing and misrepresenting intelligence, altering the information to fit the President's way of thinking, what the President thinks makes him look good.

We know this President doesn't like to hear the truth. He literally can't handle it. But what is even more alarming is that former DNI Director Dan Coats, according to Bob Woodward's new book, could not shake his "deep suspicions" that Vladimir Putin "had something" on the President.

Many Americans believe what Coats said; that the reason Donald Trump bows down in obeisance to Putin is that Putin knows something that the President doesn't want made public.

That is how egregious the pattern of President Trump's behavior has been. It cries out for an explanation, and there is no logical one. There is no honorable one. President Trump's pattern of downplaying the threat from Putin, placating the dictator, and pursuing policies that have long been the goal of Moscow asks an enormous question: What does President Putin know that President Trump is so afraid of?

Here is what needs to happen. Before we leave for the election, there has to be an all-Senators briefing on the threat from Putin to our election. Every Senator—Democratic, Republican, liberal, conservative, North, South, East, and West—has an obligation to our constituents and the country we all love to find out what exactly Putin is up to.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. I want to thank my colleague from New York for his comments this morning. He is right. We have seen this play before. We know how it ends. Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, comes to the floor and proclaims that his latest creation is bipartisan; the Democrats have a choice to vote yes or no; take it or leave it; we are done.

We have been through this over and over again. That is not how Congress or human activity works. We have a split government between Democrats and Republicans. When we sit down together and compromise, good things can happen. We proved it March 26. The vote was 96 to 0 for the CARES Act, a \$3 trillion bill early on to address the coronavirus pandemic and to deal with the serious challenges to our economy.

Thank goodness we did it. It gave \$600 a week in additional Federal supplements and unemployment to families who were facing layoffs and closures of their businesses. We helped

small businesses injecting billions of dollars back into protecting their payroll and keeping the lights on for the day when they can return.

It worked, and it worked on a bipartisan basis, but where we are today reflects a failure and a repetition on the Republican side.

Explain to me this: Why did the Republican Senate leader refuse to physically present himself at any stage of the negotiation since March 26 for relief from this coronavirus pandemic? That is right. Senator MCCONNELL refuses to enter the room where representatives of the White House and Democratic congressional leaders were meeting to discuss a bipartisan compromise. We can't reach a compromise unless we clearly have all the parties at the table. When the Republican congressional leaders—MCCONNELL, MCCARTHY of California on the House side—boycott these meetings for negotiations, nothing happens.

I can't tell you how many times back in Illinois during the August recess I was asked, so are you going back to Washington?

I said: Yes, we are planning on going back the first week in September.

What are you going to go?

I said: I don't know.

At this point, there has been no negotiation and compromise. Today we have a vote. We have been through this before. It is a McConnell proposal that was not put to any kind of bipartisan negotiation. It is a one-sided offering. It fails in so many respects.

Think if you are unemployed, trying to make your mortgage payments, car payments, medical bill payments, credit card payments, put food on the table, make sure the kids are ready to go back to school, and Senator MCCONNELL announces, well, we are going to cut that check you have been receiving for unemployment benefits in half. It will not be \$600 a week; it will be \$300 a week.

Why? For that family, their needs and their bills are still the same. The economy is still hurting, with 30 million-plus Americans out of work, 800,000 in Illinois receiving unemployment benefits, I am sure thousands in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. And yet the reality is, what is going to be proposed by Senator MCCONNELL today will create a hardship on these families they never envisioned.

Is there any money in there to protect these families from being evicted? No. Wait a minute. How about food stamps and SNAP? Many of these families are struggling to put food on the table. Any help in this bill for them? No. How about money for testing so that we can find out if people have positive results and should quarantine themselves and stay away from others? No, not the kind of investment that is needed at this moment in history.

Time and again, what this Senator from Kentucky has given us is just an effort to say we tried. But he didn't. He didn't present himself at one of the negotiations to make a bipartisan bill.

There is one provision I just want to spend a minute on here that really is troubling. Senator MCCONNELL has announced for months that nothing will move, nothing will help Americans unemployed or small businesses until he gets what he called his redline proposal on liability immunity.

Basically, what they have done is to write a provision in this bill which absolves businesses from their responsibility to the public and to their employees when it comes to safety in the workplace and the marketplace. They have argued they have to do it because of the tsunami of frivolous lawsuits they anticipate because of COVID-19.

It turns out that that so-called tsunami has never materialized. The lawsuits that are being filed are primarily by businesses against insurance companies to decide coverage under insurance policies and by inmates in prisons who are protesting what they consider to be inhumane conditions in the midst of a pandemic. It is only a handful of lawsuits that have been filed against businesses or malpractice suits related to COVID-19 infections.

Here is the bottom line: Conscientious businesspeople in Illinois and across America are prepared to make their business place safe for the people who work there in the marketplace.

What they need is a rational, clear statement of public health experts as to what they must do. I heard this over and over again. They said to me: Senator, give me the standards on social distancing and labeling and sanitizers and masks, and we will live up to them.

We can never guarantee that someone will not file a frivolous lawsuit, but we should be able to say to people, if you will follow the public health experts with a real standard of care, then your motion to dismiss is going to prevail in that lawsuit, and that will be the end of it.

But Senator MCCONNELL thinks there is a better way to really absolve them from meeting any standard when it comes to public health. In fact, what he proposes today basically says: If you try to comply with any local ordinance, good enough; enough said; it doesn't have to be any standard of public health that is credible.

This doesn't keep America safe. What it is going to do is encourage the bad actors to do little or nothing. If we are going to deal with this pandemic, everyone has to be serious about it—from wearing these masks to social distancing, to putting up with what has become a tedious responsibility of staying away from friends and family when you want to be with them to get this behind us.

When it comes to the business and marketplace, the same thing applies. They are going to have to pitch in, if they want to reopen—and I wish they could today or tomorrow—but if I, they went to reopen, they have to pitch in with a good-faith effort to meet a good public standard. I will stand by them, and everyone else will too.

Senator MCCONNELL's approach absolves them from responsibility. It is liability immunity and an invitation for bad actors to do little or nothing in protecting innocent people, including their own employees.

I am going to yield the floor at this point and say that we can do better than what Senator MCCONNELL is offering the Senate today. We can gather on a bipartisan basis and reach a compromise if he will attend the negotiations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have listened to the minority whip here. I would say that I agree with him. This bill that we will have an opportunity to vote on later this afternoon does not have everything in it. I think almost—I think every one of us would agree, it doesn't have everything that we would like. It certainly doesn't have everything that I would like. In fact, it has a few things in there that I would have just as soon be jettisoned.

What we will have an opportunity to vote on today is a targeted relief measure. It is targeted toward our small business men and women who have been feeling the kick to the gut on a daily basis in my State and certainly in a State like Florida that relies on tourism. It is targeted relief that is designed to help our kids get back into school and teachers to be able to be in a safe environment. It is targeted relief that is designed to help provide additional childcare resources. It is targeted relief to help us advance to a vaccine that is readable and traceable and affordable to all Americans. It is targeted relief that will help us with additional testing.

I think we recognize that more testing is going to be better than less testing. There is assistance for the U.S. Postal Service. It is not enough, in my view. I would like to see it increased significantly, but that is not in there. But there is some targeted relief for our Postal Service as well.

The minority whip mentions the liability protection that is included within this measure. It has been no secret that that has been a priority not only of the majority leader but of a majority of so many of us who have looked at and heard from those in our communities, our school districts that are concerned about their liability, our small businesses that are concerned about reopening with no liability. This is not a "get out of jail free" card. This is designed that if you have followed the protocols, if you have followed the requirements that have been set out there, that you are not going to lose that business. Your school district is not going to be, really in terms of their funding, eroded because of litigation. Again, it does not absolve if you have been negligent in any way here.

What I want to reinforce is, we will have an opportunity here to vote on a measure today that is not everything

to everybody. We couldn't get there. Negotiations—I think it is fair to say we all wish that there had been greater success with broader bipartisan negotiation. We haven't gotten to this place.

We are at a place where we do have an opportunity to put a measure out there that is more directed in its targeted relief; that does leave out certain areas; that, in my view, does include some things that should not be in here, but it is where we are today.

We either have an opportunity to do some incremental steps to build on what we put in place with the CARES Act several months ago or to do nothing for an indeterminate period of time.

I can tell you that in my State, I have small businesses for whom the PPP was a lifesaver. But I come from a State where we are pretty seasonally focused with our economy, and the relief they were able to get for those few months in the summertime, that allowed them to stay open.

When you don't have your tourists come to town and when you really don't have your economy kick into gear during the summer—believe it or not, folks—it doesn't happen in the wintertime in Alaska. We don't have those people coming to visit us. We don't have the cruise ships. We don't have the airplanes that are filled with people willing to come and spend their money. So we have to wait until at least next May. Alaskans, right now, are hoping and praying that they can hold on until May.

There are some things in this targeted relief package that directly helps them. There is an opportunity for a second round, an opportunity that is focused on our smaller businesses, an opportunity for an extension of time within which to pay down those CARES Act monies. The thing I have heard more often than anything else is this: Give us more time to spend this because we don't want to spend it on things that we don't need right now because we know that the winter is going to be long and dark and tough. Give us that ability. We didn't get the flexibility that we had asked for. That would have been important.

The time extension will be important. The loan forgiveness piece for the smaller loans will be important. The extension of the additional UI will be important. No, it is not a full \$600, but it does allow for additional support for those who are suffering most.

Again, what we are trying to do is to target the relief and not put it all out there in areas where some didn't need it, some did, and hope we get it right. Again, this is a measure that many will say is a half measure, but I am talking to folks back home who are saying: Give us something. We need to have something now because otherwise we don't know how long we can hold on.

This is something that I am going to be supporting later this afternoon, de-

spite what I point to as the flaws in it. I am not going to spend my time here today to talk about why I disagree with some of the school choice provisions that are in here. I think my position on that is relatively well known. But I am going to vote for this regardless of the fact that those provisions are in there because there are provisions that are going to help our fishermen, that are going to help our small businesses, that are going to help our schools, and that are going to help us help those who need this additional unemployment insurance.

There is a measure in this bill, though, that has evoked an interesting bit of controversy. It is in an area that I offered. This comes from the text of my American Mineral Security Act. This is a bill that we reported from the Energy Committee last year. The portion of the bill that is in controversy right now, according to my friends on the other side of the aisle, is actually text from a bipartisan bill that my friend and the ranking member on the Energy Committee inserted himself. I cosponsored it. It would effectively authorize the Department of Energy to conduct research to develop advanced processes to help recover rare earth elements from coal and coal byproducts. It authorizes. It doesn't appropriate. It authorizes \$23 million a year for 7 fiscal years.

We saw that this was a particularly worthy provision to advance. We know that we import almost all of our rare earths from abroad, primarily from China. We know the supply is precarious. China has already demonstrated its willingness to cut off another country when it feels like it. And we know we need this, whether it is for iPhones, flat screens, jet engines, satellites. It is all about supply chain.

I was a little bit bemused, I guess, when I saw that this particular provision was the object of partisan scorn. It was actually the Obama administration that helped fund the research to examine the potential of these technologies. NETL, the National Energy Technology Lab, has been working on this, as have a number of universities. When you think about what we are doing here, we are seeking to recover rare earths from coal waste. It is a little bit like turning your trash into treasure. It is the ultimate in recycling. You have already disturbed the earth. That has already happened. What we are doing now is we are going through that and trying to determine if we can't utilize some of that waste for something of great value—rare earths. It could ironically add to our domestic supplies without necessitating new mines. You would think that those on the other side of the aisle who don't like mining would agree that recycling that waste is a strong and a positive thing to do.

Some have said: Why is this American Mineral Security Act or any of the provisions in this bill at all? I think one of the things we learned from this

pandemic is that supply chains really matter, whether it is supply chains in the pharmaceutical end or supply chains when it comes to these minerals. They are so essential to everything that we do.

There have been some interesting attacks on this bipartisan provision. One of my Democratic colleagues declared that it could "fast-track coal mines." One said it is "targeted to corporate donors." Another said on Twitter that this amounts to "corporate welfare to the coal industry during a climate emergency." It is so wrong on so many levels that you don't know where to begin to rebut that.

Let me just cite a couple. For a starting point, the Department of Energy has a research mission. DOE does not permit coal mines. So there is no fast-tracking under the provision because there is no authority within the DOE to do so. It doesn't exist. We are not putting labs in charge of the review process. You are not going to see one of your National Labs now become a permitting office.

I have also been surprised to hear that research grants from the Department of Energy are somehow or another corporate welfare now. I have a great deal of respect for the work that goes on within DOE. I think that they are the ultimate engine for innovation, leading to good jobs, economic growth, cleaner air, cleaner water. These grants are not just directed to industry. Many of our universities will be among the likely recipients.

It is important, I think, to recognize that what we are establishing within this measure is something that would benefit our economy, benefit jobs, and benefit the environment. I mentioned that this provision is an authorization of appropriations. It doesn't allocate any taxpayer dollars. It simply creates a new option for those of us who serve as appropriators to choose as part of our normal budgeting process. We have seen a lot of accusations—misleading attacks over different things that are in this bill or perhaps some things that are not in the measure.

I think, again, what we have in front of us is an opportunity to provide targeted relief to Americans at a time when they are in need. What we do today, how we do it today, I think, is important. I think it is unfortunate that we will likely see this as a wholly partisan exercise. I would like to think that we would have a different outcome. I would like to think that each of us can look at these provisions and say: Well, it might not be as much as I would like for my constituents in Florida or Alaska, but it does allow us to advance one step further.

My hope is that we will continue aggressive negotiations because I continue to hear from people in my State who are still reeling from the impacts of this pandemic. They do not see the upcoming months giving them notable relief from an economic perspective. They want to know that their Federal

Government will be a partner with them in aiding them in the recovery.

We will have an opportunity to vote on this later. I would certainly hope all Members look at where we are today with the offering that is in front of us. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled for 11:30 begin now.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER. 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) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 165 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Fischer	Peters
Baldwin	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hassan	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Heinrich	Rosen
Braun	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	Smith
Cornyn	Lankford	Stabenow
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	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young

NAYS—15

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Sanders
Booker	Markey	Schatz
Brown	Menendez	Schumer
Cantwell	Merkley	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Harris Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas T. Cullen, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 166 Ex.]

YEAS—79

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

NAYS—19

Bennet	Klobuchar	Schumer
Blumenthal	Markey	Smith
Booker	Menendez	Stabenow
Cantwell	Merkley	Udall
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Heinrich	Sanders	
Hirono	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—2

Harris Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Diane Gujarati, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 167 Ex.]

YEAS—99

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

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China, with a further amendment No. 2652.

Mitch McConnell, John Barrasso, Shelley Moore Capito, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, James M. Inhofe, Kevin Cramer, Richard C. Shelby, Martha McSally, Pat Roberts, Tim Scott, James Lankford, Dan Sullivan, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment with amendment No. 2652 to S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations