

her law degree from Wayne State University.

She is the first Chaldean judge to serve at the circuit court level in Oakland County, MI, and she is now the first Chaldean-American to serve on the Federal bench. So I am very, very pleased that she was confirmed today.

Judge Jarbou greatly values the opportunity she has been given, I know, and has worked to extend those opportunities to others during her career.

She is active in the Michigan legal community and in the Chaldean American Chamber of Commerce and other cultural organizations.

She served as a mentor and has worked to increase the diversity of clerks in her own courtroom. Again, I am just very pleased that she was overwhelmingly confirmed by the U.S. Senate today.

HONORING MILITARY VETERANS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise now on behalf of the more than 19 million people in our Nation and half a million people in Michigan who show us every day what service and sacrifice and love of country is really all about.

These patriots landed on beaches in Normandy and the Pacific theater, crept through jungles in Korea, shed blood in Vietnam, survived attacks in Iraq, and fought terrorists in Afghanistan. These people are heroes. They love our Nation so much. They are willing to put their lives on the line for our democracy, our people, and our way of life.

That is why it is so incredibly shocking and infuriating to hear the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, disparage our veterans. President Trump called them losers and suckers—losers and suckers. He said he couldn't understand why anyone would join the military because "What is in it for them?"

He said veterans who had lost limbs shouldn't be in parades. Why? Because he couldn't handle seeing them. He didn't think people would want to see them. People in Michigan want to see them and thank them and do so every day.

We all remember what he said about our former colleague and friend, the late Senator John McCain. President Trump said that he prefers veterans who didn't get captured.

My own dad served in the Navy during World War II. He signed up because he believed in a cause bigger than himself. Perhaps President Trump doesn't understand, but my dad was a sailor, not a sucker.

About one in four people who have served in our armed services now live with a service-connected disability. President Trump, these veterans are leaders; they aren't losers.

President Trump wonders what is in it for them. Well, maybe he should ask them because we all know what they would say. We all know what they

would say: pride, duty, honor, the feeling that comes from putting something or someone above yourself. It is becoming increasingly clear that these aren't feelings that the current occupant of the Oval Office understands.

My dad once told me something I have never forgotten. In fact, it has influenced my whole life as an elected official. He said that a veteran should never stand at the back of any line for a job, for healthcare, for education, or for the military recognitions they earned. My dad came home after World War II and went to school on the GI bill, and I don't know what would have happened to our family if he had not had that opportunity. So my dad said over and over again that a veteran should not stand at the back of any line. They certainly shouldn't be put at the end of the line by their own President. It is appalling that this even needs to be said, actually.

When I heard these comments and heard them verified over and over again in every media outlet from right to left, verifying that, in fact, these were his comments, it was stunning. It was appalling. It made me very angry.

Our veterans deserve a place of honor at the front of the line—at the front of the line. They deserve a Commander in Chief who respects them, who honors their service, and, frankly, who gets it. Thank goodness we have people who believe in things beyond themselves. Thank goodness we have people who are willing to stand up for all of us, to keep us safe and stand up for our values and our country.

So on behalf of the people of Michigan, I want to say thank you to everyone who has served and everyone who is currently serving our country in our armed services. We are truly grateful for your sacrifice and service and your willingness to stand up and support and defend our country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, thank you. I am on the floor today to talk about the coronavirus pandemic and what we can and should do here in the U.S. Senate and in Congress as a whole to actually address the ongoing problem.

We are not out of the woods yet. We still have a healthcare crisis and, of course, an economic crisis that is a consequence of that.

We have done some good bipartisan work over the past 6 months. In fact, not many people realize that we have

actually passed five or six bills with strong bipartisan majorities. The one people know about most is the biggest one, the CARES Act. I think it got 97 votes here on the floor of the Senate—97 to nothing.

We have in the past been able to figure out a way to come together as Republicans and Democrats and as Americans to be able to address this crisis. We need to do it again because we still do have a crisis. We still do have unacceptably high levels of people getting infected, hospitalized, being in the ICU, fatalities, and, of course, our economy is not where any of us would like to see it although it has improved significantly, in part because of the legislation we passed here.

I am convinced that we would be at over 10 percent unemployment still if not for the legislation we passed here. Instead, we are beginning to come down—8.4 percent last month. That is faster than anybody thought it could. Still, of course, it is unacceptably high.

So more help is needed, and we can't let the upcoming election and the politics around that keep us from getting together and continuing to do the work that we have to do. We haven't been able, in the last 5 or 6 weeks, to do that. Instead, we have been working kind of on opposite sides of the aisle on our own projects.

Today we voted on a bill that had a majority of the U.S. Senators supporting it. That is not how you pass something around here; there has to be a supermajority—60 votes. But a majority of the Senators in this Chamber just voted for legislation that has strong bipartisan appeal I would think because, as we will talk about in a second, almost every element is supported by the Democrats, Republicans, and, most importantly, by the American people.

What we have done is we have kind of fallen into camps. So the Democrats passed a bill in the House called the Heroes Act. It is a \$3.5 trillion bill. Remember, we have already spent about \$3.5 trillion, making this the largest deficit in the history of our country and making our debt now, for the first time since World War II, the size of our entire economy. That concerns all of us, and it should. I hope it concerns all of us because our fiscal situation going forward for our kids and grandkids is something we should be concerned about too.

Anyway, the \$3.5 trillion bill is a grab bag, to be honest. Some of it is related to COVID-19, but some of it is not. As an example, there is a provision in there that I hope would be a non-starter that changes our tax laws and repeals the State and local tax deduction cap that was put in place just recently. This gives a huge break to wealthy Americans. In fact, 40 percent of this benefit, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, goes to the top 1 percent of wage earners. What does that have to do with the coronavirus? It will help millionaires

on both coasts a lot, but it really does not affect the crisis that we are in.

They also want to use this \$3.5 trillion package as a way to make changes in our immigration policy. Now, that is pretty controversial stuff as it stands, and that is going to make, of course, that bill hard to pass because of the immigration policy. People have strong views on it. It has no place in a COVID-19 bill.

One that also concerns those of us who are concerned about the election coming up is it puts Federal mandates in place on the States that are unprecedented with regard to their election system. Now, that is something we have always left to the province of the States, but, instead, it puts mandates in place on the electoral system. That is not, again, something that is going to help us in terms of the coronavirus.

So my hope is that those House Democrats who passed that bill can now see what we passed over here. This is a targeted bill that focuses on the coronavirus. It is less than \$500 billion, which used to be a lot of money around here, but as compared to the \$3.5 trillion. So it is obviously a lot less money, but it is also more targeted and more focused.

Again, I think so much of it is policy that can be supported by both sides of the aisle. It will really help to continue the efforts we started here to help address the healthcare crisis but also help with regard to the weak economic performance as a result of people being isolated from the economy.

I heard someone this week say we have a K-shaped recovery. What does that mean? Well, think of the letter "K." A lot of people say you want to have a V-shaped recovery, where you go down steeply through a recession and you come back up just as steeply. That is where I think a lot of America is. In other words, a lot of families and a lot of businesses have seen a pretty rapid recovery here in the past few months, but there are others who have not.

So the top part of the K is true for a lot of people and a lot of businesses—think of the businesses that provide food, the grocery stores; the businesses that are involved in construction, businesses like Home Depot or Lowe's that provide building products. They are doing well. They are at the top of the K. They are in the V.

But there are others that are in the bottom. That would include travel and hospitality. It would certainly include the airlines and bus companies. They are having a tough time. Many of our smaller retail businesses—certainly our bars, movie theaters, and bowling alleys—they are having a tough time. So there is a bottom end to that.

This is an uneven recovery, and we have to acknowledge that. Therefore, to my colleagues on my side of the aisle who might say, you know, we have done enough; the recovery is on; everything is good, unfortunately, that is not true. I wish it were. I wish we

had turned the corner on the economy and also begun to turn the corner on the virus. We can't say that yet. We have made progress. No question about it. I think we are on the right track, but we are in a K-shaped recovery, I believe.

By the way, it is the same thing with individuals. Think about it. If you own your own home, the value of your home has probably gone up. You are probably in pretty good shape, particularly if you are trying to sell your home right now. It is a good time to sell, I guess. If you invest it in the stock market, which a lot of the people who own their homes are, it has been darn good. The market increase has been substantial. I was on a program this morning where they were talking about how the Nasdaq was back up again, and the tech stocks, if you are in the tech world, are doing great.

But let's say you don't own your own home. Let's say you are a renter. Your rent is likely to start going up if it hasn't already, and then, you are not invested in the markets, so you are not taking advantage of that, and yet your job is at risk and may be gone. So, again, K-shaped isn't it. Some people are doing quite well, and others are still having a rough time and need help to be able to deal with the issue of the coronavirus and the economic fallout from that.

By the way, this K-shaped recovery, I believe, has increased inequality in terms of our income in this country, and income inequality was something we were making progress on. In February, we had the 19th straight month of wages increasing over 3 percent in this country just in February, not long ago. And, by the way, most of that increase was among lower and middle-income workers. Now, that was positive. That was where we wanted to head as a country. That is why so many of us pushed for tax reform and regulatory relief thinking that would get this economy moving and help those workers who are in the lower and middle-income bracket the most, and, guess what, it did.

That has changed now so we have to, here in Congress, in my view, continue to help, continue to do things that will help with the healthcare crisis and with regard to the underlying economic situation that is affected by it.

One thing that I think was very positive about today is that we were able to pass legislation that has many, many bipartisan elements to it. I think the vote we just had—again, where a majority of Senators in this Chamber voted for a targeted COVID-19 approach—I think this gives us a chance to reset, a chance to get back to the bargaining table, and a chance to say: OK. Now the Republicans have put forward a proposal that has a lot of very reasonable provisions in it.

The Presiding Officer here today was part of that. He put provisions into the bill that has to do with our schools. It is widely popular. There are other pro-

visions in there that I think there is very little disagreement on. Let me highlight a few of them.

One is on the healthcare response, particularly on our testing capacity. Republicans and Democrats alike know that testing is critical. We need it. In Ohio, we are looking for more funding for testing because we know that is how you stop the spread of the disease—testing, contact tracing, getting to the hotspots and trying to contain it. That way people will feel more comfortable returning to work, returning to shop, and returning to school. This is something that is in this legislation, \$16 billion alone for testing. The legislation that was voted on this afternoon in this Chamber was voted positively by a majority of the Senators.

Just last week, in Ohio, I visited The Health Collaborative, which is a multi-agency coalition approach to dealing with COVID-19. It includes hospitals, county commissioners, health commissioners, and even nursing homes. They are utilizing the \$19 million they have received through the CARES Act to fund and design and execute a testing strategy for people in the Southwest Ohio area. I am really pleased to see them take the funding and using it in this way because now more and more people are getting the opportunity to be tested, and, by the way, they are doing it on a no-needs basis. There is no need to pay for this testing with your insurance. If you don't have it, everybody is welcome to get a test.

These kinds of initiatives are a big help, and I am glad that in this legislation we voted on this afternoon, we added another \$45 billion in total to HHS to go toward testing and vaccine development to get this vaccine as quickly as possible, and distribution of the vaccine, helping on the antiviral medications. This "Shark Tank" concept that the Presiding Officer and others are involved in is brilliant because it sort of tells the private sector: Look, we are going to provide you the basic funding to go out there and compete to come up with a safe way to develop a vaccine or antiviral therapy, and that has encouraged competition in it, and in unprecedented speed, we are developing these alternatives—thank goodness—and we need them. Hopefully, by the end of this year, we will have them.

Second, I think we agree that Congress should double down on any COVID-19 policies in previous legislations that have worked well, and, one, of course, is what is called the Paycheck Protection Program. That is in this legislation we voted on today too. Back on August 8, it ended. So if you are a small business out there and you have not already taken advantage of the PPP program that many of your peers have and you have seen them be able to keep their doors open because of it, you are out of luck right now because the program is not accepting new applicants. So we need to extend that program. I think everybody agrees with that. I don't know a Senator in

this Chamber who doesn't have an experience back home of a small business saying: I couldn't have stayed open without this. I visited three or four businesses just in the past few weeks in Ohio, and all of them had the same story.

Different timing, different businesses, some in construction, some in the restaurant business, some in manufacturing, but what they all tell me is they needed that influx badly. It provided them a low interest loan—1 percent. They converted it into a grant, effectively, because the loan was forgiven if they used it for their salaries or for their utilities or for their mortgage or rent. They would have had to close their doors and let a lot of people go. They were able to hang on.

For some of these businesses, like the manufacturer I visited, thank goodness, because they would have let go 30 percent of their workforce. They didn't have to do that. They kept everybody on. Now they are going great guns. They are looking for people. By the way, they are having a tough time hiring people. They are looking for people. That is a good sign that you have businesses out there trying to pull people into the workforce. That is in this legislation.

My hope is that we are going to see Republicans and Democrats agree on this. I think they do agree. Reinstating the PPP for the foreseeable future so that more small businesses can take advantage of this smart loan program is a smart thing to do. It is more targeted, and it does require you to show a loss of revenue. That is OK. That is good. We want this to be targeted and focused. We don't want to waste money.

Third, the bill reflects that Members on both sides of the aisle recognize that Congress should give additional support to our schools. I mentioned this earlier, but \$105 billion in this bill goes to education—about \$70 billion to K-12, our primary and secondary schools and high schools, and that is needed right now. We are trying to reopen around the country, and many of these schools are telling me: ROB, I have got additional costs. I have got these Plexiglass shields I have to put up. I have to reconfigure the classroom. I have to hire more teachers because I want smaller classrooms so that if someone gets sick, it will be infecting a smaller group. There is funding that is needed for remote learning. So this is good for us to provide funding for these schools because that will enable them to reopen and reopen safely and stay open. That is in this legislation.

There is also funding in here for colleges and universities. I think there is about \$30 billion for that. Again, it is the same thing I am hearing back home from our colleges and universities, some of which are having a tough time staying open. They do need more help, more testing, more PPE, personal protective gear, so this is im-

portant too. Again, that is all in this legislation.

Interestingly, I mentioned the Heroes Act earlier, the \$3.5 trillion bill that the House Democrats passed not too long ago as kind of their alternative, that had funding for schools also. Guess what. This bill that was passed—well, not passed but voted on by a majority of Senators today in the U.S. Senate—actually has slightly more money than the Heroes Act has for education. What is the big issue here? Why can't we get together and figure this out?

There are so many opportunities here. Finally, I would just say that one thing that this bill does and one reason it is called a targeted bill is it repurposes funding that we have already appropriated here in the first four or five bills but that has not been used and is not likely to be needed. So isn't that smart? I mean, as taxpayers, don't you want to be sure that we are not just throwing money at this problem if it is not needed?

The Treasury Department, in particular, has been helpful in working with us, saying they have a bunch of money that they could use for a loan program that they haven't had much takeup on because, frankly, the commercial lending is going pretty well right now. People are able to get the money from their bank. They don't need to come to Treasury or the Fed as much as we thought they might, so there is money left over. We are talking hundreds of billions of dollars. So that should certainly be used to offset the cost of any new program. I think that is just a commonsense idea. I can't imagine anybody in this Chamber, if they think through this, would be against us repurposing the funds we have already appropriated toward new uses that are more targeted. That is in this legislation too.

I think those things all have bipartisan appeal, and it seems to me, again, this is a reset. Let's face it, the Democrats have been saying over the past several weeks: Well, fine, we have got our bill we passed, the Heroes Act. What have you guys put out showing that at least a majority of the Senate and pretty much every Republican can support? Now we have done that.

So we have our stake in the ground, and they have their stake in the ground. There is a lot of overlap. I just talked about four areas where there is considerable overlap, but there are many others as well. We should be able to figure this out on behalf of the American people.

We have a campaign ongoing for President, for Senators, and for Members of Congress. We have to look out for the interests of the American people here. We can do both. We can campaign and also be working on our legislation that is absolutely needed right now for the healthcare and economic future of our country.

By the way, only about one-third of the Senate is up for reelection, so for

two-thirds of us, we don't even have an election to worry about, and yet it seems like this place has become way too political too quickly. Let's focus on taking this bill that was voted on today where the majority of Senators supported it and figure out ways to work with Democrats to come up with a new approach that enables us to continue the effort to help with regard to this K-shaped recovery and to help with regard to the ongoing healthcare crisis we are facing.

I want to mention, if I could, three or four other things I would love to see in the final bill that did not make it into the so-called targeted bill. I understand why they didn't, and, in part, because we weren't looking to put a lot of tax provisions in there because it is not a tax vehicle, but I do think there are other things that have broad bipartisan support that we ought to include.

First, I think we would all agree it is important that the taxpayer-funded research that is supported by this legislation, research into antiviral medications and research into vaccines, is protected from other countries, in particular, China coming into our country and taking that research. This is taxpayer-funded research, and we know, from what the FBI has told us and what the Department of Justice has told us, that this is currently at risk. It is currently at risk.

With that in mind, we need to include legislation that safeguards our American innovation. This was actually in the legislation that was introduced by Senator MCCONNELL a few weeks ago called the Heals legislation, and the legislation that I am talking about is called the Safeguarding American Innovation Act. It stops this kind of theft of research and innovation at our research institutions, our colleges and our universities. That is one where Republicans and Democrats have come together. It is a bipartisan bill. It is the result of a committee process. It is the result of an investigation that took over a year. It is the result of a lot of hearings and a lot of work. It is solid legislation to encourage us to be able to protect the research we are doing, including on the coronavirus.

Second, for a while now, there has been a bipartisan consensus that a smart coronavirus response should include tax incentives to help our economy to not just open and reopen but to do so safely and effectively. Small business owners I have spoken to during this pandemic, especially in recent weeks, have told me they are eager to reopen, but they want to do it in a safe manner. And we want them to do it in a safe manner. Let's provide some incentives for that.

One example of how that process can be helped along is an expanded tax credit for new hiring called the work opportunity tax credit. It is already out there. It is legislation that passed years ago. It helps, let's say, veterans, returning citizens, who are looking for a second chance. It gives them the

chance to get a job because the employer gets a tax credit for a while, and then almost always that person ends up getting a job.

Let's include the COVID-19 unemployed in that—people who have lost their jobs because of COVID-19. That makes all the sense in the world to get people back to work.

There is also something that is in law now based on the CARES legislation called the employee retention tax credit. I think this is very important. Companies that couldn't access the PPP because they didn't qualify or didn't want to will have access to this program kind of as an alternative. It gives companies a tax credit against their payroll taxes—the employer side of the payroll taxes—if they keep people on or bring people on. Again, this makes all the sense in the world right now to encourage more hiring to ensure we can get this economy moving again and do so safely.

Speaking of safety, I have also introduced a new tax credit that was part of the HEALS legislation that was introduced a few weeks ago. It is called the healthy workplaces tax credit, which helps businesses pay for this protective equipment, like the plexiglass shields and like the PPE that they now need, which is expensive. Just the gowns and the masks and the gloves—those expenses add up, particularly for businesses that are having a tough time because of the weakening economy out there.

These credits will help them not just reopen again but reopen safely. I think getting these kinds of tax credits into the coronavirus legislation would be very smart. Again, these should be bipartisan efforts.

Third, while I am pleased we are revitalizing the successful PPP program, I think there are steps to improve it that we ought to take up in whatever our final package is.

For example, one oversight in the original PPP legislation is that people who have been convicted of a felony going back 5 years are not able to accept a PPP loan.

One day, I get a call from a guy back home. Troy Parker is his name. Troy said: I can't get a PPP loan. I am a guy who had a financial issue, a financial fraud issue. I had a felony conviction. I got out of incarceration, and I started my own business. I took my second chance.

He said: I did everything that you are always talking about, PORTMAN, which is that you want to encourage people to take that second chance. You want to give them that opportunity to get the training to be able to do that.

Then he went out and hired a bunch of other second-chance folks, and he started a cleaning business. It is quite successful. But obviously, with coronavirus, a lot of the offices he cleaned and others said: We can't have you come in. He lost his businesses. He was about to shut his doors. He couldn't get a PPP loan. Why? Because

within the last 5 years, he had a felony conviction.

That is not what we should be doing here. We shouldn't be penalizing people who have turned their lives around and have done all the right things and are hiring other second-chance individuals. We should be helping them to stay on their feet and to continue to do what they are doing for themselves, the community, and the workforce. So we worked with the Treasury Department, and to their credit, we got them to put forward a temporary solution, which was a change in the rule so that Troy could get his PPP loan and others like him around the country. We now need to make that permanent. That is an example of something we should do—totally bipartisan.

I worked with colleagues on the other side of the aisle on this issue, and I will continue to because this is one where, again, Republicans and Democrats alike, as Americans, would want this to be part of the legislation.

Fourth, while I am glad this bill reflects the bipartisan support for educational funding, I had hoped it would also reflect that Republicans and Democrats alike have come out for additional support and flexibility for State and local governments.

Ohio has been particularly hard hit here because our cities in Ohio, unlike your city—wherever you are in America, probably—can use income taxes as a revenue source. I think 90 percent of cities can't do that, but in Ohio, we can, and we do. Obviously, income taxes went down with this coronavirus, and the economy fell short, so they suddenly find themselves with less revenue coming in and then additional expenses: fire, police, EMS, coronavirus expenses for public health.

It has been tough for a lot of our cities in Ohio, so I have been pushing for not just more funding on a targeted basis, showing need, but also more flexibility to be able to use the funding for closing that revenue gap, which is caused by the weak economy, which is caused by the coronavirus. So it is related. Certainly, we ought to be able to do that on a bipartisan basis. That is what a lot of Democrats have said they would like to do. I am not the only Republican who wants to work with Democrats on that. We could get that into a final bill, and that would help all of our cities. Let's move forward on this.

Finally, I think all of us agree that we need to have better access to telehealth. Telehealth medicine has been one of the few silver linings in this dark cloud. A lot more of my constituents are using telehealth. One way they are using it is for behavioral health, mental health services, and another is for addiction services, but also, just generally, telehealth has been something that has been very helpful.

A lot of people say that in the last few months, we have gone 5 years ahead of where we would have been in terms of telehealth. I think the same is

true with regard to teleworking and with regard to telelearning. But with regard to telehealth, based on a poll I recently saw—a survey by Morning Consult—one in every four adults—25 percent—has used telehealth recently during the pandemic. It has been a lifeline for so many people, particularly for some people who are fighting addiction and can't get in-person care to help their recovery or people who have mental health challenges and are able to access telehealth to help them.

I have worked with the Trump administration to expand telehealth and delivery options, which in some instances has, for instance, allowed addiction specialists to reach new patients they hadn't been able to reach before.

There have been some positives here, but these reforms are only temporary. We need to make these permanent as well. We don't want to lose ground on this issue, so Senator WHITEHOUSE, on the other side of the aisle, and I have introduced legislation called the TREATS Act. We want that to be part of the final legislation as well.

We have an opportunity to help with telehealth by expanding broadband access as well so that more Americans can access these services from home. This also relates, of course, to education when schools are telling us they are going to go to partly in-person classrooms, partly remote, and some altogether remote. If you live in a rural area of America, you may not have access to broadband, and you are at a disadvantage. Also, in a lot of our urban school districts, there may be the infrastructure for broadband, but it is not in the home.

We need to help more in terms of broadband. I am the Senate sponsor of a bipartisan, bicameral bill called the Rural Broadband Acceleration Act, which basically speeds up the FCC's distribution they were going to make anyway of \$20 billion in rural digital funds to go toward the building of broadband networks. This will help spread high-speed internet over more than 400,000 miles of internet fiber cables, bringing about 3 million new households online immediately if we can get this done. By the way, it employs thousands of workers as well. I think it is a great investment in infrastructure that is needed right now. So people talking about infrastructure—this is one we could do right now that helps with regard to telehealth, telemedicine, telelearning, and teleworking.

The Nation will be looking to Congress in the coming weeks to work together to make sure that we can improve our response to the coronavirus and to help get this economy through a tough time. Now more than ever, we cannot revert to the norm, which is partisanship these days. We cannot do that with regard to this issue.

Using this new targeted bill as a base—the one that, again, got a majority of Senators in this Chamber to vote

on today—and voting on some of the areas of agreement I have outlined today, we need to come up with an appropriate and effective bill that responds to the challenge.

I am going to continue to work with Republicans and Democrats alike to insist we put the partisanship aside and work on behalf of our constituents to take the necessary steps to get us through this unprecedented healthcare crisis and to get us on the other side of the economic crisis. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together to do the same.

Thank you.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 589.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark C. Scarsi, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 Mark C. Scarsi, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Tom Cotton, Rob Portman, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn, Lamar Alexander, John Thune, Steve Daines, James Lankford.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 590.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stanley Blumenfeld, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 Stanley Blumenfeld, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Tom Cotton, John Cornyn, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, Lamar Alexander, John Thune, Steve Daines, James Lankford.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 773.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Pat Roberts,

Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, Tim Scott, Steve Daines.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 774.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 Todd Wallace Robinson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, Tim Scott, Steve Daines.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 812.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David W.