

Up the T-Band Act, which repeals the requirement that public safety stop using this spectrum.

The heroes who jump into action when we need them shouldn't have to scramble to figure out how they will communicate with each other. They shouldn't be left in limbo.

My legislation has support from an inspiring coalition of advocates and public safety groups. The International Association of Fire Chiefs, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, the National Public Safety Telecommunications Council, and many others are demanding that we preserve the T-Band.

These groups and the people they represent are not asking for a favor; they are just asking to be allowed to do their jobs effectively.

I thank Leader SCHUMER for his partnership on this issue and his longstanding commitment to the public safety community. I also want to thank Ranking Member CANTWELL and Ranking Member SCHATZ for their work and dedication to this effort.

But don't just take our word for it. Listen to what the current Republican chairman of the Federal Communications Commission recently said about T-Band. Earlier this year, Chairman Ajit Pai stated: "An FCC auction of the T-Band is a bad idea."

This is not a partisan issue. It is a public safety imperative. There is no cost associated with stopping the T-Band auction, and Congress must ensure that the people who step up to keep us safe are taken care of.

If we fail to act, the FCC will have no choice but to move forward and strip this resource from our first responders. To allow that to happen during a public health crisis like the one we face today would be reckless.

First responders already face enormous strain economically and enormous pressure to address the pandemic, as well as deadly natural disasters across the country. The last thing we should be doing is saddling them with millions or billions of dollars in costs to needlessly alter their critical communications system.

Congress can no longer drag its feet. We have run out of time. The FCC has called on this body to stop the T-Band auction, but the Commission has no choice but to start laying the groundwork to auction the T-Band. We can and we must resolve this problem today. Today is the day to do it.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 451 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be con-

sidered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am here today to object to this unanimous consent request on behalf of the junior Senator from Texas, Senator CRUZ.

As the Senator from Massachusetts knows, Senator CRUZ is also deeply interested in this issue. Both Senators have complementary pieces of legislation. They have had the language of their legislation agreed to unanimously by both the majority and the minority of the Commerce Committee.

So I would ask the Senator from Massachusetts to reach out to the Senator from Texas, and I understand he is fully willing to work with the Senator from Massachusetts on amending the House bill to ensure that it passes the Senate with the Cruz amendment that would not be objectionable to supporters of this bill.

As a result, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I just think that we are missing an enormous opportunity here. It is a shame the Senate is not acting with the urgency it needs in order to help our brave men and women who are first responders in our country.

We can work on issues of spectrum going to the private sector. We can do that in a separate bill, and we can do it together. But, here, we have an opportunity to help our first responders, the brave men and women who every day risk their lives, and we have to make sure they have the spectrum they need to communicate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

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

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

REMEMBERING LAURIE SMITH CAMP

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, less than 2 weeks ago, this country lost one of its most brilliant legal minds—Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Her passing has left a void that can be felt all across our Nation from Nebraska to Washington.

Sadly, Nebraska recently lost another great jurist—Judge Laurie Smith Camp. Judge Smith Camp was the first woman to serve my State as a Federal judge, a position she had held since 2001. This body voted 100 to 0 to confirm her just 6 weeks after President George W. Bush nominated her. That doesn't happen very often anymore, and her unanimous approval was a testament to her incredible talent.

Judge Smith Camp grew up in Omaha, but she left Nebraska to attend college at Stanford University. She graduated with distinction. And I am glad to say that she came back home to attend the University of Nebraska Law School where she distinguished herself again as editor-in-chief of the Nebraska Law Review.

Before becoming a Federal judge, she served her State through a series of jobs that spanned the legal profession. She began her career in private practice but soon moved on to become general counsel for the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, the head of the Nebraska attorney general's civil rights section, and then the chief deputy attorney general for criminal matters for the Nebraska attorney general. These wide-ranging experiences were part of what made her an exceptional Federal judge.

Another part was her love for the law and the compassion that flowed from it. She was well known for her dedication to equal treatment for all, regardless of background, and for a sentencing philosophy that preferred rehabilitation to punishment.

She also understood that success isn't just about achieving your professional goals. She was profoundly generous with her time and, when she wasn't leading Nebraska's district court, she could be found promoting women's participation in the legal profession or mentoring young Nebraska attorneys. This was in addition to recently being elected president of the Omaha Bar Association—a job that she had held since June.

Laurie was also my friend. She spoke at an event I held in 2016 called Bridging the Gap, which aims to encourage women to engage in their communities at the local, State, and Federal level. I am lucky to have known her personally and to have seen up close the wise advice and the quick wit that made her famous among her colleagues and those she mentored.

Through her example, she inspired a generation of young women in Nebraska and beyond to pursue careers as attorneys, advocates, and community leaders, just as Justice Ginsburg did. Both of these extraordinary women blazed a trail that today's young women and girls can follow. I join with both their families in mourning their passing and celebrating their lives.

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.

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

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

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROUTE 91 HARVEST FESTIVAL SHOOTING

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, immediately after a tragedy, we wake up each day and feel the full force of it

again. The shock, sorrow, and anger can hit us so strongly, it is hard to breathe, and that is the first part of mourning.

Eventually, the darkest times in our lives start to feel more familiar. They still hurt as much as ever, but they don't surprise us, and they become part of us.

Three years ago tonight, bullets split the air at the Route 91 Harvest Music Festival in my hometown of Las Vegas, NV. They sounded like fireworks, like a celebration, but these were the first shots in the worst mass shooting in modern American history.

Within minutes, those present at the outdoor festival understood at least some of what was happening. A gunman, high up in a hotel room, had taken aim at the people below. Hundreds of people were shot, and hundreds more wounded trying to get to safety. Fifty-eight people lost their lives that night and 2 more have passed from grievous wounds since.

Within minutes, Nevadans began working together to save lives and help those in need. From those with years of training as first responders to just bystanders whose only qualification to help was a car at the ready, Las Vegas pulled together. Nurses and doctors rushed to hospitals, and ordinary Nevadans stood in line to give blood. Individuals and corporations donated their time and energy, as well as blankets, food, and other support.

In the 3 years since, many all over the State of Nevada have worked to mark what happened through memorial crosses, sculpture, a commemorative community center, and many scholarships honoring the memory of those who lost their lives.

Those 3 years have not erased the loss of the victims, the pain of the survivors, or the scars of the first responders who rushed into danger to save lives. If anything, the legacy of the Route 91 shooting has expanded during that time, not contracted.

Like ripples on a pond, the impacts of this shooting linger. It affects different people in different ways. For many, fireworks on the Fourth of July are a reminder of what they went through that day. Geena Marano has learned to prepare herself for Independence Day and New Year's Eve, but if a car backfires unexpectedly, she has to start the process of reminding herself: You are safe. It is OK.

Her sister Marisa, who was also at the festival with her, says that her own daughter has picked up the habit of reacting to loud noises. She says: "It breaks my heart because my trauma has passed to her."

The fear resurfaces for these sisters in so many situations—on anniversaries, including of all the shootings since then; at high schools where Geena was doing outreach to students and feared that she was putting herself at risk of another shooting; passing the Strip, eerily empty during the pandemic like it was on the days after the

festival; anywhere where there is darkness and music, even on an evening out.

The Marano sisters are not alone. While the tragedy of the Route 91 shooting may be 3 years behind us, for many survivors, a moment can bring it all roaring back. This is one of the reasons I am so committed to getting more funding and support for mental health and substance abuse treatment in this country. Just because you can't see many of the scars from the Route 91 festival, it doesn't mean they are not there. That is true for mental health in general. So many Americans deal, on a daily basis, with challenges that even their closest loved ones can struggle to understand.

Many first responders, for instance, carry the trauma they see at scenes of crime, disaster, and tragedy with them. I introduced legislation to provide confidentiality to Federal law enforcement who use peer counseling services and to track law enforcement suicides in order to develop more effective prevention programs for our first responders.

For everyone struggling with mental health concerns, peer support can be key, which is why I have introduced the Virtual Peer Support Act to help these key behavioral health programs move online to meet huge community needs during this pandemic because it really does take a community of support to help people through tough times.

Treating the wounds, visible and invisible, from the Route 91 Harvest Festival shooting is only one part of what we owe the survivors. The other part is to take more action at the Federal level, to prevent attacks like this in the first place, to reduce the gun violence that we have become far too accustomed to.

Overwhelming majorities of Americans want commonsense gun reform, including many responsible gun owners like those in my own family. We can do this here in Congress. Nevada has done it. At the State level, we have banned the bump stocks used in the Route 91 shooting; we have closed the loophole that lets private sellers sell guns without background checks.

We can and should do all of these things at the Federal level. I have pushed for all of these things during my time here in the Senate because no family should have to go through what I saw that Monday night at the Reunification Center in Las Vegas when families were waiting to hear what happened to their loved ones the night before at that concert. No one should have to struggle for years with chronic pain, physical or mental, when we can take sensible measures to prevent it.

To all of the families I met who have been touched by this tragedy and for the hundreds more that I have spoken with, I want you to know that Nevadans haven't forgotten you. We are all still Vegas Strong. We are all still here with you. We are still working together

to get you what you need in the wake of a tragedy whose impact has not faded over time; it has just changed and shifted.

Tonight, at home, let us all remember those who felt the impact of the Route 91 shooting, from survivors, to families, to firefighters, nurses, and volunteers. Let us move toward an America that protects its communities from violence and that helps those who lived through it heal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, 3 years ago on this very date, in my hometown of Las Vegas, a gunman opened fire from the 32nd floor of the Mandalay Bay Hotel onto the unsuspecting crowd below. This horrific attack lasted just over 10 minutes, but in that brief window of time, 58 innocent lives were taken and over 400 were injured. It was the worst mass shooting in American history. I stand here today to recognize the third anniversary of this act of terror.

I want to speak today about how that October 1 shooting changed Nevada. This mass shooting irrevocably altered the lives of countless families in Las Vegas, NV, and across the country forever.

Many of that night's victims are still dealing with the injuries, visible and not visible. Many are still grieving and working through the effects of this devastating trauma. All of them have suffered through a pain that no family, no friend, no spouse, no child should ever, ever have to endure.

In the 3 years since the shooting, two more victims have passed away due to injuries they sustained that night—1 in 2019 and 1 earlier this year—bringing the number of lives lost up to 60—sons, daughters, parents, friends, neighbors—people who were loved, people who were part of our community, people who were taken from us far too soon, 60 families who will forever have an empty chair at their Thanksgiving table.

Amidst the violence and the terror, there were also heroes who made the choice to run toward danger and help others, like the courageous first responders who risked their lives to provide aid and everyday citizens who helped others escape in their cars.

Nevada remembers October 1 because it showed us the darkest side of humanity, but in the aftermath, it also showed us the brightest and best of who we are.

Today we commemorate the 60 lives that were lost. Today we recognize those who were injured and are still struggling. Today we celebrate. We celebrate the heroism of our community—not just in the immediate aftermath of that attack but in the days, weeks, months, and years since. We saw heroes spring into action that night and the following days to save lives. In the following days, we saw so many members of our community display incredible

heroism. Our community lined up to donate blood. They helped to reunite friends and family in the aftermath, and they helped to financially support victims and their families.

The phrase “Vegas Strong” came into being after that time, and let me assure you, it is a phrase that could not be more true. The strength of our city is simply astounding. We work to build ourselves back up from crisis, side by side, arm in arm. It has taken time. It hasn’t been easy. Even now, we are still not all the way there, but every day, the people of Las Vegas show unparalleled resilience. Nevadans carried that resilience with them. They carry it in every challenge and in every crisis that we face.

I stand here today to honor the men and women who lost their lives on October 1, those who were injured in the attack, and the heroes who helped bring our city back.

I also call on Congress to show the same kind of strength that the people of Las Vegas have shown. Our Nation currently faces many challenges. However, my colleagues must recognize the threat that gun violence poses to our communities. We must honor the memories of those who were lost. We must take commonsense action to reduce gun violence and ensure that more lives aren’t lost.

As a legislative body, we must act. The Bipartisan Background Checks Act—a bill passed by the House 582 days ago—has been waiting for a vote here in the Senate. Today, in honor of the memories of the lives that were lost, I request that the Senate bring this bill, this important bill, for a vote.

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. 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.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday I had the pleasure of meeting—or should I say re-meeting—Judge Amy Coney Barrett, who has been nominated, as we all know, to the U.S. Supreme Court, to the vacancy left by the death of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

Over the last few days, Judge Barrett’s nomination has been applauded by people across the political spectrum—and for good reason. Her background in practicing law and academia and on the Federal bench has provided her with an unquestionable knowledge of the law. Much of the praise has come from her colleagues who worked closely with her over the years.

Marcus Cole, who is dean of the University of Notre Dame Law School, where she teaches, said:

Judge Amy Coney Barrett is an absolutely brilliant legal scholar and jurist. She is also

one of the most popular teachers we have ever had here at Notre Dame Law School.

A group of her former students have published a piece recently that said:

While we hold a variety of views regarding how best to interpret statutes in the Constitution, we all agree on this: The nation could not ask for a more qualified candidate than the professor we have come to know and revere.

We have also seen support for Judge Barrett from unlikely sources. Harvard University Law Professor Noah Feldman clerked with Judge Barrett at the Supreme Court more than 20 years ago. He was also a prominent witness for Democrats during the impeachment process earlier this year. But he has written an opinion piece titled “Amy Coney Barrett Deserves to Be on the Supreme Court.” He wrote that he knows her to be a “brilliant and conscientious lawyer who will analyze and decide cases in good faith, applying the jurisprudential principles to which she is committed. Those are the basic criteria for being a good justice. Barrett meets them and exceeds them.”

There is really no question that Judge Barrett has a brilliant legal mind and deep respect for the Constitution and an unwavering commitment to the law, but these qualities alone are not what set this exceptional judge apart. Both Republicans and Democrats who have worked with Judge Barrett throughout her career have spoken about her personal qualities, like humility and integrity. These make her an ideal candidate for this influential position.

A group of her former students wrote about the kindness that she has shown to them, both in the classroom and during meals they shared at her home. They said:

Her genuine interest in the personal lives of her students outside the classroom, and the seamless way that she modeled for all of us the integration of her professional and family life, reinforces that there is more to life than the pursuit of professional accolades.

She has certainly proven that to be the case. In addition to rising to the very top of her field, Judge Barrett is a mother of seven children ranging from the age of 8 to 19. Following her nomination on Saturday, Judge Barrett credited her family’s ability to balance her and her husband’s successful careers with the needs of their children to the unwavering support of her husband Jesse, who is also an accomplished attorney.

In every respect, Judge Barrett is an inspiring role model for young people and I could say as the father of two daughters, of young women in particular, who are pursuing their professional and personal ambitions with equal vigor.

If confirmed, Judge Barrett—soon-to-be Justice Barrett—would become the first mother of school-age children to serve as a Justice and only the fifth woman throughout American history to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. Considering the woman whose seat she

will fill if confirmed, the significance of that fact cannot be overstated.

She would be the only current Justice with a degree from a law school other than Harvard or Yale and bring much needed educational diversity to the Bench.

I have always thought it bizarre that, among all the highly qualified lawyers and judges in America, for some reason, it is overly populated with people educated in the Northeast, on the coast.

On top of that, she would join Justice Thomas as the only Justice born in the South and bring another perspective to the Court, whose members largely hail from the coast.

If confirmed, Judge Barrett would bring an underrepresented view to the Supreme Court. I know we would all be proud to have somebody like her—a woman of such strong character—serving our Nation in this very important capacity.

I want to commend President Trump for selecting this outstanding nominee. I was glad to spend some time with her yesterday. She has an unquestionable character, a brilliant mind, and the kind of temperament needed to serve on the Court. I am eager for the American people to see that for themselves as we begin the public confirmation process.

As we know, this is the second time Judge Barrett has appeared before the Judiciary Committee in the last few years. It was 3 years ago when the committee and the Senate confirmed her to her current position on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. However, there were some warning flags.

During her confirmation hearing back then, 3 years ago, the Democrats on the committee raised questions over Judge Barrett’s strong Catholic faith and questioned whether it would somehow disqualify her or impair her ability to discharge her responsibilities.

One Senator went so far as to say: “The dogma lives loudly within you, and that’s of concern.” Another asked her whether she was an “orthodox Catholic.” Well, this statement and that insinuation were discriminatory at best and unconstitutional at worst.

The Constitution itself includes that there is no religious test. Article VI reads: “No religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.”

This is not the first time somebody has been targeted for one’s Catholic faith. I was reminded of the speech that John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave in 1960 in Houston, TX, to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association. In addressing some of the explicit and implicit arguments that somehow he would be beholden to the Vatican rather than be able to discharge his responsibilities as President of the United States, he pointed out, as a Catholic, it was not the only concern because, if people would do that to a Catholic, why not do it to a Baptist or a Muslim or a Jew?