

how many workers get sick, no matter how many workers they kill, it is on their watch—no matter how many workers they kill, you are going to be on the corporation's side every single time? And the answer in Trump's America is yes.

Instead, he could mobilize workers. He could mobilize American manufacturers to get every American worker the masks and protective equipment they need. He could issue an OSHA temporary standard that would provide clear, enforceable requirements for keeping workers safe.

He could stand up for workers. He campaigned on it. He could actually stand up for workers. But he will not. It is always the same story with this corporate President, always the same story. He wants to protect the big guys—workers' health and workers' safety be damned.

He campaigned in 2016, in my State—he surprised people how much he won by in my State. He campaigned by promising he would look out for workers. He went all over Ohio; he went all over the industrial Midwest—the Great Lake States areas—telling workers he would take care of them and would fight for them.

Now we know how much these workers' health and how much these workers' lives mean to this President—about \$10 each. He has betrayed these workers over and over. His corporate tax cuts—Senator THUNE was talking about Democrats and taxes and the deficit in an easy-to-understand way. He betrayed these workers over and over. Corporate tax cuts: 70 percent of the benefits went to the richest 1 percent. He took away 100,000 Ohio workers' overtime pay. He took away overtime pay from workers in Savannah, in LaGrange, in Newton County, and Jasper County, GA. He took overtime pay away from my constituents in Cleveland and Mansfield and Shelby and Chillicothe.

He stacks the courts with corporate lawyers. Those lawyers—now judges—will always decide for corporate interests against workers' interests.

He launched a boycott against Good-year, a unionized tire-making plant headquartered in Akron—one of the greatest companies in our State and one of the most renowned, iconic companies—because somebody made a statement about one of his "Make America Great" hats. He launched a boycott costing who knows how many jobs in that company.

He has betrayed workers by his failure to fight for autoworkers and their jobs. He promised workers in Lordstown, OH: Don't sell your homes. This plant may close, but don't sell your homes. We are going to bring back these jobs.

Then he did nothing when we asked him to help, and they shut down, costing 3,000 jobs.

Most recently, he and Senator MCCONNELL and all their minions who follow Senator MCCONNELL's lead took

away \$600 a week in unemployment benefits. What are those workers to do? What are those workers to do in Georgia? What are those workers to do in Ohio? What are those workers to do in Illinois and Delaware when their \$600 a week just disappears?

I know there are a lot of wealthy people on both sides of the aisle. There are a lot of very wealthy people here. There are millionaire Members of the Senate. When I hear millionaire Senators and billionaire people in the administration say that \$600 a week is just too much money—we can't give these unemployed workers that much money. That \$600 a week is too much money. They are going to get lazy. They are not going to work.

When I hear millionaire Members of the Senate say such things, it sickens me. That \$600 a week is the reason that millions of Americans didn't fall into poverty during this terrible, terrible recession. But lo and behold, the administration is happy and the Republican Senators are happy because the stock market has recovered. I know a lot of you in this institution have a lot of money in the stock market. I won't even get into the conflicts of interest when you own this stock and you vote this away. Forget about that. You have a lot of money in the stock market, so I know you are really happy. I know the Presiding Officer and Republican Members of the Senate are really happy that the stock market recovered in the spring. So then Donald Trump doesn't even have to pretend to care about getting this pandemic under control.

Corporations are doing fine. Never mind the workers who are getting sick. Never mind the essential workers. The essential workers are the busdrivers, food service people, custodians, security people, people who work in grocery stores and drug stores.

The essential workers—who are mostly women, disproportionately people of color, who mostly are barely adequately paid—the essential workers face something most of us don't: They work all day exposed to the public. They wear masks. They are safe—most of them. They do things safely. They work all day, and then they go home always anxious.

Madam President, imagine feeling every day when you go home that you might have contracted coronavirus and you might pass it on to your family. Imagine the anxiety these generally low-paid workers face every day when they go home. We don't think about them around here because corporations are doing fine and the stock market has recovered. The workers go home every night worried they will affect their families. Most of them won't; they will get along just fine.

American workers are tired of this. They are sick of this. They are tired of the empty promises. They are tired of the betrayals. They are tired of feeling like no one in this government, in this Senate, in this White House is on their side.

If all of you would—could actually lead when the President doesn't, we could pass a bill issuing an OSHA—Occupational Safety and Health Administration—temporary standard, protecting people. We could issue a temporary standard to protect people on the job. We could pass pandemic pay. That is what the House of Representatives down the hall did.

When the House of Representatives passed their bill and they took that bill down the hall and put it in Senator MCCONNELL's office there, I guess that bill got lost. One of the things that bill did have was pandemic premium pay. If you are one of those workers—I know this amount of money doesn't mean much to the Presiding Officer or most of my Senate colleagues, but they would get up to \$10,000 pandemic pay because they expose themselves in the workplaces—essential workers—to this illness. It would actually pay these essential workers for putting their health and their lives on the line to serve us.

It is time for us to step up. If you love this country, it is time we fought for the people who make it work. It is time we fought for the people who make this country work. Instead of always siding with U.S. corporations and with the wealthiest people in this society, it is time we decide in this body to actually fight for workers.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today in support of four highly-qualified California nominees to the U.S. District Court: John Holcomb, Mark Scarsi, and Judge Stanley Blumenfeld to the Central District of California, and Todd Robinson to the Southern District of California. (These four nominees know the districts where they will serve if confirmed, and I believe they have demonstrated in their legal careers the skills needed to serve as fair and impartial judges. All four of these nominees received Well Qualified ratings from the American Bar Association, and all have significant legal experience in California.)

John Holcomb, who has been nominated to the Central District of California, is currently a partner at the law firm Greenberg Gross. Mr. Holcomb has spent more than 25 years in private practice, focusing on intellectual property issues. He also served as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Navy. I understand that if confirmed, Mr. Holcomb will be sitting in the Riverside Courthouse, which is badly in need of judges.

Mark Scarsi, nominated to the Central District of California, is currently managing partner of the Los Angeles office of the law firm Milbank, Tweed, Mr. Scarsi joined that firm in 2007 after spending more than a decade with other California-based law firms, including O'Melveny & Myers and Christie, Parker, & Hale. Mr. Scarsi specializes in patent cases, with a focus on intellectual property. He has tried some 28 cases to verdict, judgment, or

final decision, including 20 cases in which he served as lead counsel.

Judge Stanley Blumenfeld, nominated to the Central District of California, currently serves on the Superior Court for Los Angeles County, where he has presided over some 200 trials since his appointment to the bench in 2006. Prior to that, Judge Blumenfeld spent nearly two decades as a practicing attorney, including 7 years as an Assistant U.S. attorney for the Central District of California.

Todd Robinson, nominated to the Southern District of California, is currently a Federal prosecutor in that district, where he has served since 1997. Mr. Robinson has significant experience litigating in Federal courts, including in the Southern District of California. He has tried more than 40 felony cases to verdict, including 35 as sole or lead counsel.

In closing, Mr. President, these four nominees are highly qualified, they have extensive practical experience, and they are ready to hit the ground running. It is my hope and expectation that these nominees will receive broad bipartisan support. I will be voting in favor of these nominees, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON ROBINSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Robinson 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 176 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Bennet	Boozman
Baldwin	Blackburn	Braun
Barrasso	Blunt	Brown

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

NAYS—10

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Booker	Markey	Wyden
Cantwell	Merkley	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Sanders
Harris	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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 David W. Dugan, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

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

the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), 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 yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Ex.]

YEAS—56

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

NAYS—40

Baldwin	Hassan	Schatz
Bennet	Heinrich	Schumer
Blumenthal	Hirono	Shaheen
Booker	Kaine	Sinema
Brown	King	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Gillibrand	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Sanders
Harris	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 40.

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 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 Stephen P. McGlynn, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Todd Young, Joni Ernst, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Deb Fischer, Mike Crapo, John Thune, Richard Burr, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, Tim Scott, Thom Tillis.

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 Stephen P. McGlynn, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.