



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2020

No. 171

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, we cry to You, but sometimes You seem so far away. In our despair, You sometimes seem distant, and we are tempted to surmise that we are all alone.

When we shout, we seem to hear the echoes of our anguish. Nonetheless, we know that You are holy, mighty, and good. We have trusted You too long to let go.

Empower our Senators for these challenging times. Remove from their minds all bitterness and contempt for one another. Keep their hearts clean, their spirits courageous, and their minds clear as they face these daunting times.

We pray in Your omnipotent Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The President pro tempore.

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

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

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, President Trump was rightly criticized

for dodging a question about the peaceful transfer of power. Instead, Trump criticized mail-in ballots and rejected the premise that he will lose.

No, that doesn't mean that he is planning some sort of coup, but it is important for any President to choose their words very carefully.

The same is true for partisans on the other side whipping up fear that our democracy is in jeopardy or that the ballots will not be counted. Even worse is the rhetoric setting the stage to delegitimize any future Trump victory.

We now hear full-blown conspiracy theories. Let me mention a few. A group of Biden supporters conducted a war game speculating that the President will not leave office without a Biden landslide, questioning what the military would do.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stepped in with a simple civics lesson. The U.S. military has no role in the elections, he said.

Democrats have doubled down on this debunked theory that the Postal Service is plotting with Trump to disrupt the election mail. The Postal Service does not answer to the President of the United States. It has plenty of capacity to deliver election mail. Plus, the Federal Government doesn't run elections; the 50 States run those elections.

A key goal of Russian "active measures," dating back to the Cold War, has been to get Americans to doubt their government, its leaders, and democratic institutions. Let's not do Russia's dirty work for them. No American should be questioning our free and fair elections.

Now to my State of Iowa. Our people who have requested absentee ballots will have ballots mailed to them starting on October 5. Remember to fill it out completely, including your driver's license or voter PIN number, and mail them to your county auditor well before election day but not later than the day before.

Your ballot can be tracked on the secretary of state's website. Check out where your ballot is.

I have great faith in Iowa's election officials and our postal workers. Iowans who vote in person or absentee can be assured that your vote will count—the same as any election.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, at this time last week, the Nation did not know whom President Trump would be nominating to the Supreme Court, but, amazingly, we did know what kinds of false attacks the far left would deploy against whoever it was.

Democrats and special interests have been telling the country for 45 years—45 years—that every Supreme Court vacancy under a Republican President was going to bring about the apocalypse. John Paul Stevens, they said, was anti-woman. David Souter, they said, wanted to hurt vulnerable people. John Roberts was out to get health insurance.

And wouldn't you know, the President had barely finished saying Judge Amy Coney Barrett's name before the same old attacks began rolling in. Our 77-year-old male former Vice President and our 69-year-old male Senate Democratic leader have tried to inform

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S6009

American women that this 48-year-old working mom wants to roll back her own rights as a woman—roll back her own rights as a woman.

Democrats have tried to fearmonger around a 4-year-old academic paper that reinforced one unfair penalty in ObamaCare, which Congress, by the way, already eliminated 3 years ago.

As an aside, if the American people are interested in which Senators are serious about protecting Americans with preexisting conditions, they can simply look up the vote Senators took last night—just last night. Every single Democrat voted against legislation from Senator TILLIS that would have cemented protections for these vulnerable Americans.

Democrats voted to block protections for preexisting conditions just like they voted to block hundreds of billions of dollars for coronavirus relief and just like they voted to block police reform—and a thousand other things they tell Americans they support but vote against to block bipartisan progress.

So here is another one of the made-up attacks: Democrats are demanding that Judge Barrett commit in advance—in advance—to recuse herself from entire categories of cases for no reason. This is another totally invented standard. Nobody has ever suggested that Supreme Court Justices should categorically sit on the sidelines until the President who nominated them has left office. What an absurd suggestion.

Justices Ginsburg and Breyer were confirmed during President Clinton's very first term. Justices Sotomayor and Kagan were confirmed during President Obama's first term. All four of these Justices went on to participate in election-related proceedings while the President who had nominated them was on the ballot.

Justices Breyer and Ginsburg participated actively in Clinton v. Jones and other matters connected to President Clinton's eventual impeachment. In fact, they urged and attempted to get the Supreme Court even more involved.

This is a sideshow—a sideshow. If Judge Barrett is confirmed, she will swear an oath. She will have a lifetime appointment. Nobody seriously is suggesting she lacks any bit of the integrity which everyone trusted Justice Ginsburg, Justice Breyer, Justice Sotomayor, Justice Kagan, and countless others to exercise. In fact, her integrity and independence are precisely what Judge Barrett's peers across the political spectrum go out of their way to applaud.

Judge Barrett has no obligation to make any of the bizarre—bizarre—prejudgments that our Democratic colleagues are demanding. Like I said, much of the script has been entirely predictable.

I will tell you one thing I did not predict. I honestly did not expect the Democratic leader to come to the Senate floor and say that concerns about

anti-religious discrimination are “manufactured hysterics.” I didn't expect that.

I do not expect we will hear the leader of the Democratic conference stand on the Senate floor and say that America's freedom of religion is “an imaginary issue.”

The Democratic leader claimed indignantly that his fellow Democrats would never—never—make an issue out of a nominee's personal religious beliefs. He took great offense that such a thing would even be suggested.

But the whole country knows that, 3 years ago, when the Judiciary Committee was considering this very nominee—this one—for her current position, Senate Democrats did precisely that, exactly that. The senior Senator from California literally implied in front of the entire country that Judge Barrett was too Catholic—too Catholic—to be a judge. Here was the quote: “The dogma lives loudly within you,” she said. “And that's of concern.”

The senior Senator from Illinois asked Judge Barrett in the official record—listen to this—“Do you consider yourself an ‘orthodox Catholic?’”

The junior Senator from Hawaii felt compelled to tell the nominee—listen to this—“You would be a Catholic judge.” “You would be a Catholic judge.”

No one imagined these exchanges, but they happened on video before the entire Nation. Multiple sitting Senators fretted in an open hearing that Judge Barrett's religious views created doubts about her fitness to serve.

Outside the Senate, it was not imaginary when one faith group in which Judge Barrett and her family participate reportedly came under cyber attack a few days ago. Their membership directory was reportedly hacked, just as Judge Barrett emerged as a frontrunner.

Nobody had to imagine the ominous articles from AP, Reuters, the Washington Post, and POLITICO, all implying there was something questionable—questionable—or problematic about Judge Barrett's faith practices.

Nobody had to imagine POLITICO sending a contributing editor to snoop around the church buildings and report what a youth group had written on their whiteboard.

So, no, Americans don't have to imagine this elite disdain. All they have to do is read it.

It is not just this one nominee. Nobody imagined it when the junior Senator from Vermont accused a different nominee of hatred and Islamophobia because he had previously expressed a personal view that Christianity gets things right, which Islam gets wrong.

It is not imaginary when the junior Senator from California cast aspersions on yet another nominee for—listen to this—belonging to the Knights of Columbus. And another Democrat implied he should quit this mainstream Catholic group if he wanted to hold public office. Quit the Knights of Columbus if

you want to hold public office? In America?

The Democratic leader says these are manufactured hysterics. He says people who call this out are hysterical. Frankly, it would be better for our country if that were true, but that is not the case.

Just yesterday, 24 hours after the Democratic leader swore that Democrats would not make this an issue, the junior Senator from Hawaii tried to say Judge Barrett's faith is “irrelevant” but immediately proceeded to question “whether her closely held views can be separated from her ability to make objective, fair decisions.” No one—no one—should be deceived by these thinly veiled euphemisms.

This is the exact form that religious discrimination had taken in America for decades—for decades—especially when it comes to public service.

We do not often hear people say they simply dislike a particular religion altogether. Thank goodness we are mostly past that kind of bigotry. No, going all the way back to Jack Kennedy, the more common accusation has been something a little more subtle—that people of deep faith or certain faiths are incapable of being fair or objective; that they are incapable of doing certain jobs well; that such Americans are torn between divided loyalties and not to be trusted.

Here is what the left is trying to say: Oh, we have no problems—no problems—with Judge Barrett's faith in an abstract sense. We just think it disqualifies her from this promotion.

Madam President, that is the definition of discrimination.

About a century ago, openly anti-Catholic political cartoons pictured the Pope or the Catholic Church as an octopus wrapping its tentacles around the institutions of American Government. Thankfully those displays are long gone, but the core attitude clearly is not.

Americans of faith are not imagining the increasingly hostile climate that the political left and the media have spent literally years sowing. And, no, there is no free pass, as some commentators have suggested, because many prominent liberal voices or prominent Democrats themselves identify as Catholic. You don't get a free pass just by calling yourself a Catholic.

More than one-fifth of our country belongs to the same church as Judge Barrett—one-fifth of our country. Tens and tens of millions of Americans—all of them—like all Americans, must be free to live their faiths in diverse and different ways without being barred—without being barred—from public service. These kinds of aspersions do not become any more acceptable if the call is coming from inside the house.

Sadly, none of these problems are imaginary. The American people's concerns are not manufactured.

The Little Sisters of the Poor did not wake up thinking it would be good fun if the Obama-Biden administration tried to force them to violate their own

consciences. These nuns did not manufacture their lengthy legal battle for the fun of it. It was the secularizing left that went on offense.

Churches all across America did not go looking for one of this cycle's Democratic Presidential contenders to suggest places of workshop should lose their tax exempt status if they preach or practice traditional teaching. It was the secularizing left that went on offense.

If parts of the elite American left have become this out of touch with mainstream religious beliefs held by millions and millions of their fellow citizens, it will take more than victim blaming to dig out of it. They could start this week. They could start today.

They could commit to evaluating Judge Barrett on her credentials and her qualifications, and they could stop gawking at deeply religious Americans like they have encountered extra-terrestrial life or bought a ticket for a safari.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 4773, S. 4774, S. 4775

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there are three bills at the desk due for a second reading, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4773) to establish the Paycheck Protection Program Second Draw Loan, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 4774) to provide support for air carrier workers, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 4775) to provide continued emergency assistance, educational support, and health care response for individuals, families, and businesses affected by the 2020 coronavirus pandemic.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the measures will be placed on the calendar, en bloc.

PROTECT ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 554, S. 4675.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to proceed.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 4675, a bill to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5602

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak to one

of the most significant issues facing the security of our Nation. It is a question of domestic terrorism, specifically the threat of violent White supremacists.

In Tuesday's Presidential debate, moderator Chris Wallace asked President Trump to condemn White supremacists and rightwing militia. President Trump refused. Instead, he replied—and I quote—“Proud Boys, stand back and stand by.”

The Proud Boys, a far-right group that promotes and engages in violence, viewed President Trump's words as a call to action. The group's leader Joe Biggs said he took the President's words as a directive to “[F] . . . them up.”

I was appalled, but not surprised, by the President's words. He has a long history of inflammatory, racist remarks. Now, President Trump claims that violence is a “left-wing problem, not a right-wing problem”—his words.

Let me be clear. I join Vice President Biden in condemning all violence, but we know that White supremacists pose a great threat. An unclassified May 2017 FBI-DHS joint intelligence bulletin found that “white supremacist extremism poses [a] persistent threat of lethal violence.” This was a finding by the lead law enforcement agencies of the Trump administration. They went on to say that White supremacists were responsible for more homicides from 2000 to 2016 than any other domestic extremist movement. The director of the FBI, Christopher Wray, in response to a question I posed in the Senate Judiciary Committee last year, said that the majority of domestic terrorism arrests involved White supremacists.

Now, for years, I have urged the Trump administration to respond to the ongoing threat of violent White supremacists and other far-rightwing extremists. Instead, they have repeatedly downplayed this very lethal and real threat.

Attorney General Barr has never responded to the multiple letters I have sent, asking what the Department of Justice was doing to combat White supremacist violence.

Unfortunately, as we have learned from former Trump administration officials themselves, the Trump administration has downplayed the threat of violent White supremacists. POLITICO recently reported that a draft homeland threat assessment report from DHS was edited to weaken language on the threat posed by violent White supremacists. And a DHS whistleblower alleged that DHS officials, including Ken Cuccinelli, requested the modification of the report to make the threat of White supremacists “appear less severe” and add information on violent leftwing groups.

It is not enough to just stand here and condemn the President's remarks at the infamous debate. The American people sent us to Congress to act. There is something we can do now.

There is something that we can do that will show we are prepared to respond to this threat to law and order, to this threat of violent White supremacists.

I am the lead sponsor of the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act, bipartisan legislation that would address the threat of violent White supremacists and other domestic terrorists.

Our bill would establish offices to combat domestic terrorism at the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the Department of Homeland Security. It would require these offices to regularly assess the domestic terrorism threat and focus their limited resources on the most significant threats. Critically, they would provide training resources to assist State, local, and Tribal law enforcement in addressing the domestic terrorism threat. The House companion to my bill was introduced by my colleague and friend Congressman BRAD SCHNEIDER of Illinois.

Just last week, the House of Representatives passed our bill on a unanimous voice vote. The Senate should pass it today.

In a few moments, staff will provide me with the language to ask for a unanimous consent. I am waiting so there is an opportunity for both sides to discuss the procedure moving forward. In the meantime, several of my colleagues have asked to come to the floor and address the issue. I would yield to them for comment or question, through the Chair, with the hopes that when the procedural language arrives, I might be able to make the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I am here today on probably one of the most serious national security issues that we will confront. I say that as a member of the Armed Services Committee, having received a variety of classified briefings on threats to this country. Some of them regarding ongoing foreign interference in our election are truly chilling. But the threat to our national security from White supremacists, now operating so openly that the Director of the FBI has said they are one of the paramount threats and an ongoing security threat to our Nation, demands that there should be action now.

The bill that my colleague Senator DURBIN is offering passed unanimously by the House of Representatives within recent days. Let me repeat. It passed unanimously by the House of Representatives. It reflects the real and urgent danger of this threat.

The President has refused to denounce White supremacists. The President has told one of the most prominent of those groups to stand by. That failure—an abject failure on the part of the Commander in Chief—to respond to an ongoing security threat demands this action now. We must stand up for the integrity of our elections, the security of our Nation, and the fundamental freedoms that we prize as American people.

We will not allow this cancer to metastasize in this country and thwart the will of Americans who are going to the polls, in effect, right now. The ballots are being cast. The threat to our electoral will is ongoing.

I am proud to join my colleagues who are here on the floor who represent an ideological spectrum, as did the House of Representatives in unanimously approving this bill. The paramount threat to our Nation and the integrity of our elections is White supremacy, violent extremism, and nationalism that potentially jeopardize the very pillars of our democracy.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I rise to support the efforts of my colleagues to bring the unanimous House bill establishing legal procedures for dealing with White supremacy to the floor of the Senate. I do so in honor of four Virginians.

In August of 2017, a group called Unite the Right held a White supremacist rally in Charlottesville, VA. They started on a Friday evening, when Jewish residents of Charlottesville were gathering in synagogues and when students were coming to the University of Virginia to start their academic careers. They rampaged through the campus and community chanting slogans from Nazi rallies like “Jews will not replace us” or “Blood and soil.”

As if that were not terrorizing enough, on the next day, they escalated physical attacks against many. Heather Heyer was a Charlottesville resident and paralegal with an amazing background and story who was peacefully protesting that day, and a White supremacist from another State revved his car up, hit her and killed her.

DeAndre Harris was a special education instructional aide in Charlottesville, and he was set upon by a number of White supremacists and beaten severely with objects.

There were two Virginia State Troopers, Jay Cullen and Berke Bates, both of whom I knew. Jay Cullen often flew me in a helicopter when I was Governor, and I met Berke Bates, the trooper, because he was part of Governor McCullough’s security detail. They were called out on that day, which would have been a day off. They were called out on that day because they needed to provide extra security as this White supremacist rally ran amuck in Charlottesville. On that day, both of them lost their lives as their helicopter malfunctioned.

I stand on the floor of the Senate thinking of these four Virginians—two of whom I knew, three of whom lost their lives, and one who was injured severely in this Unite the Right rally—to say that it is time we have laws in this country that would enable us to appropriately deal with the chief source of domestic terrorism. For that, I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Senator DURBIN for this bill. Thank you for the colleagues who are on here.

I was struck when Senator KAINÉ rose in honor of those who died in Virginia. The list goes on and on. You can go to Emmett Till. You can go to the four girls, Addie Mae Collins, Carole Robertson, Denise McNair, and Cynthia Wesley. You can go to those who lost their lives in a church in Charleston, SC. The thing that connects them all is not just that they died because of the color of their skin, not just because of the White supremacists who were trying to change the political dynamic in this country. It is an unbroken stream that goes back decades and generations. It goes back to the time of the great original sin of slavery, when White supremacy tried to dominate this country, and it goes back to a string of unbroken deaths that are occurring even as we speak.

Hate crimes across this country have proliferated, whether it is not just White on Black or it is the Tree of Life synagogue. It is so many things that we have to stop.

The interesting thing to me of what happened this week is that the day after the Presidential debates when the President of the United States refused to condemn White supremacy, the Governor of the State of Alabama, my friend Kay Ivey—Republican Governor of the State of Alabama—apologized to the victims of the 16th Street Baptist Church bombing that occurred 57 years ago. It was an implicit acknowledgement that words matter, that statements of public officials have an effect on people. They give a green light to violence, often even unintended.

This bill Senator DURBIN has proposed that passed, as Senator BLUMENTHAL and others said, unanimously is a statement that we cannot allow this to continue. It is a statement that we will—as law enforcement, as citizens, as people in a free country—we will put an end to this kind of rhetoric and this kind of hate.

Folks, we cannot let this moment pass in this body. The House passed this bill unanimously and so should the U.S. Senate. We should make a stand with our colleagues in the House—Republican and Democrat—that this is an important statement right now because what is unsaid so much right now is that we see this playing out in this country. We see it playing out in the streets. And we can talk about it from the right or the left, and we can talk about it from Republicans or Democrats, but the fact is, we need to be talking about it in terms of people and victims—innocent victims. That is what this bill is about—protecting the lives of all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin, regardless of their religion, regardless of their political persuasion. This bill will do that.

Give the FBI the tools necessary. Give the statement from the U.S. Sen-

ate that we will not stand for this. Support this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I am really grateful, Madam President.

It has been said, and it is quite true, that the only thing necessary for evil to be triumphant is for good people to do nothing.

Here we are at a time where we know our history. Since 9/11, the greatest terrorism we have seen in our country, actions from a church in South Carolina to a synagogue in Pittsburgh, to a Walmart in El Paso, time and time again, the violence that we have seen and the greatest terrorist activities since 9/11 have been domestic terrorism—rightwing extremists, the majority of them White supremacists.

The warnings we are now getting from our intelligence officials, according to one Judiciary hearing from the Department of Homeland Security, are that the most significant threat right now to the security of our country is White supremacy and violent White supremacy.

The FBI has given a number of warnings. We now are heading toward an election where we are seeing signs of increased activity, increased hate, increased focus. This body—this good body, friends on both sides of the aisle—this is not a time where we can do nothing. We must act. We must take measures and steps to end this kind of violent scourge in our country.

Obviously, this will not accomplish everything. But in a time like this, we must do something. I join my colleagues in support of this legislation. I want to, again, affirm the fact, quite encouraging, that it passed in a bipartisan manner in the U.S. House of Representatives. That is so encouraging. We should do the same here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MANCHIN’s name be added as a cosponsor to S. 3190.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, we are asking for unanimous consent to pass a bill that has passed the House of Representatives unanimously by a voice vote—unanimously—to empower and direct the law enforcement agencies of the United States to use their talents and resources to stop domestic terrorism, to stop the killing. We are identifying, in the course of it, the White supremacy and far-right extremism as one of the sources.

Listen to what a Trump administration Department of Justice official wrote last year in the New York Times:

White supremacy and far-right extremism are among the greatest domestic-security threats facing the United States. Regrettably, over the past 25 years, law enforcement at the Federal and State levels have been slow to respond.

Killings committed by individuals in groups associated with far-right extremist groups have risen significantly. We are not manufacturing a crisis. The Trump administration Department of Justice official concurs with our actions that they are needed.

How did I get involved in this? It goes back to 2012. As chairman of a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, I held a hearing on the threat of violent rightwing extremism after a White supremacist murdered six worshippers at a Sikh gurdwara in Oak Creek, WI. Officials from the Department of Justice, Homeland Security, and FBI—even at that time—testified about the threat posed by violent domestic extremists.

When President Trump was asked and challenged to condemn this violence, he refused.

The question is whether the U.S. Senate, now given the same opportunity, will stand as the House of Representatives has on a unanimous, bipartisan basis to say “enough” when it comes to domestic terrorism inspired by White supremacy and rightwing extremism.

Let me add that there is nothing in this bill to stop the efforts of those same agencies to police and stop leftwing extremism—all extremism. I have no problem in condemning all of it, but we are focusing on the one that is the most significant in the words of the Department of Justice.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5602 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I just found out about this bill a couple of hours ago. I have been busy. I haven't really been able to really research it, and that is part of the problem with what our Democratic colleagues are trying to do here in just quickly rushing it through the U.S. Senate. Maybe this has had a full vetting in the House of Representatives, but here, in the U.S. Senate, it hasn't gone through any committee process whatsoever.

Unfortunately, I also have to make the point—because I am sure they are trying to make a political point as opposed to trying to make law today—that I am opposed to all forms of domestic terrorism, including White supremacists. I think I speak for all of my Republican colleagues, and I think I speak for every U.S. Senator: We all abhor domestic violence and terror, including White supremacists.

Again, I don't have much knowledge about this even though I am chairman of the committee of jurisdiction of one of the Departments that would be sub-

ject to this piece of legislation. I know that the Department was not consulted on this piece of legislation. I have been given notice here that the Department of Justice does not support this piece of legislation because it says it would seriously impede its ability to work in the domestic terrorism space. Again, I am not exactly sure why the Department of Justice does not like this piece of legislation. Suffice it to say that it doesn't. The Department of Homeland Security was not even consulted on this. As chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I don't know anything about this bill.

This is not the way to pass a serious piece of legislation that deals with a serious issue. If it is a good piece of legislation, the sponsors should have no problem running it through the normal committee of jurisdiction process. In this case, apparently, it is with the Judiciary Committee, but I would think my committee would also have some pretty strong equities in this space, not to mention the fact that I have been working with my ranking member on precisely these types of issues.

Instead of just trying to make a political point, what I have always tried to do is get a result and make law, but that has to go through a thoughtful process that uses the full committee process, which is not the case here.

So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yes, I am trying to make a political point, and it should be a bipartisan political point. It should be Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, as there was a unanimous voice vote in the House of Representatives on that same measure, and I am sorry my colleague from Wisconsin has left.

The Senate's version of this bill has been pending for 9 months—for 9 months. The House has moved its version of it. It is a timely issue. Why waste a day in making America safer? Why not tell our law enforcement agencies: Now, roll up your sleeves. Go to work. Find the most dangerous things happening in this country, and stop them.

We know one of them is White supremacists and their rightwing extremism. The President fumbled and couldn't come up with an answer 2 days ago. Today, sadly, from the Republican side, we get an objection to coming together on a bipartisan basis, as they did in the House, to address this very real issue. I am troubled by this. It is a sad moment.

I do believe the Senator from Wisconsin and many others will say they are against extremism. They had a chance to prove it by passing a measure here and refused.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. Madam President, I am compelled to talk about this process that I just heard about.

There is no process, folks. Let's just be candid. This Senate is not the deliberative process body that the Senator from Wisconsin talked about. We don't have that. This bill has been pending for 9 months. But we don't have that. This is not the Senate in which I worked in 1979, where there was a deliberative attempt. There were debates on the floor, and there were debates in committee. This is not a process. Whether it is on the floor of this Senate or whether it is in the media or wherever else, when someone says that this should go through the normal process, those processes were killed a long time ago. I have been in this body for almost 3 years, and we have had only a relatively handful of amendments on any bill that has come here. We have had virtually no markups and debates in committees. Those don't exist. This bill has been pending for 9 months, which is more than adequate time for the Homeland Security Committee to have taken a look at it, more than enough time for the Committee on the Judiciary to have taken a look at it, and more than enough time to have had a hearing on it.

Apparently, our colleagues in the House felt it was OK, but this body has gotten to be so dysfunctional that, to send a statement, we will not allow a unanimously passed bill that has been pending in the Senate of the United States for 9 months to be passed.

There is one thing with which I might disagree a little bit with Senator DURBIN. For me, this is not a political statement. This is a statement about law enforcement and increasing the ability of law enforcement. It is a statement to protect victims of crime. That is what this bill is about for me. I have seen it all too often in my State and throughout the South. Again, that unbroken string—that is what I see this bill as.

So I don't need lectures about process when I see a Senate that does not function but that leapfrogs substantive legislation simply to ram a Supreme Court nominee through—one that hasn't been pending for very long, either. This is the kind of thing the Senate needs to be doing and passing, and we should be ashamed of ourselves for not doing it. Hopefully, that will change.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, before I get into the subject of this pending vote, I do want to thank my colleagues from Illinois and Connecticut for bringing this important topic before the Senate.

President Trump's refusal to condemn violent White supremacist groups in the Presidential debate has been around for several days. We have hardly heard anything out of most of our colleagues, and no one—no one, no one—is going to buy the argument that it came too suddenly. White supremacy

hasn't come too suddenly. The President's remarks have been out there for several days. It is the flimsiest of excuses to avoid criticizing the President even when every American of decency—the overwhelming majority of all Americans—would know he should be condemned.

They don't care if you are a Democrat or a Republican or are liberal or conservative. You never know how low President Trump can go, but his refusal to condemn White supremacy is among the lowest things he has done, and—boy, oh, boy—there are lots of them lined up. I am ashamed of my Republican colleagues and ashamed—for America, for decency—that they have chosen to block this.

S. 4653

Madam President, now, on another issue of great importance to America, the nomination of Judge Amy Coney Barrett to the Supreme Court has thrust the issue of healthcare back into the spotlight. Her confirmation to the highest Court in the land could put healthcare for hundreds of millions of Americans at risk.

As you would imagine, taking away healthcare is deeply unpopular with the American people. So it seems the strategy from the Republican majority is to invent some new distraction—a fresh outrage—to talk about. My colleagues on the other side would rather talk about anything besides the fact that their President, their party, and their Supreme Court nominee pose a dire threat to Americans' healthcare.

The outrage from the Republican leader was directed today, once again, at the idea that the Democrats would attack a nominee's religious beliefs, but of course, in their zeal to manufacture this issue, the Republican Senators began telegraphing this line of attack even before the nominee had been named. One Republican Senator wrote me a letter to warn against anti-Catholic attacks that hadn't happened yet against a nominee who had not been named. That is how transparent this Republican diversion—ruse—is.

It appears the Republican majority will crank up the outrage machine to any level of absurdity to avoid talking about America's healthcare—the healthcare that so many Americans desperately want and need. In fact, all week, the Republican leader has mocked the idea that a far-right Supreme Court majority might strike down the Affordable Care Act and that Judge Barrett might play a decisive role. Of course, President Trump promised to nominate Supreme Court Justices who would terminate the Affordable Care Act, and he picked Judge Barrett. Those are the President's words. He is only going to pick Justices who would terminate the Affordable Care Act, and it is no mystery why he picked Judge Barrett.

In both major cases brought against the ACA, Judge Barrett twice sided against the law. She publicly criticized Justice Roberts for upholding the law

and said that, if the Supreme Court were to read the statute the way she does, they would have to “invalidate it.” President Trump: “terminate it.” Judge Barrett: “invalidate it.” Guess what, President Trump and Republican attorneys general are in court right now, suing to do just that—invalidate our healthcare law in a case that will be heard 1 week after the election.

The threat to Americans' healthcare is very, very real, and Senate Republicans are tying themselves in knots in trying to explain how it is not. Leader McCONNELL, from the floor of the Senate, called it a joke—a joke—that Judge Barrett and the far-right majority of the Court might vote to take away healthcare or to turn back the clock on women's rights.

Maybe he didn't get that message around to his conference, because the Republican Senator from Utah, only a few days earlier, claimed that the Affordable Care Act was unconstitutional and that striking it down shouldn't tarnish Judge Barrett if that is what she chooses to do.

Another Republican Senator said he wanted to see evidence that the nominee understood that Roe was wrongly decided, that Roe was an act of judicial imperialism, and I do believe Amy Coney Barrett's record bears that out. That was his quote.

The junior Senator from Missouri expressed confidence that Judge Barrett believes Roe v. Wade was wrongly decided. On the Supreme Court, a Justice Barrett could enforce that view.

So which is it, Republican leader? Is it absurd to think that Judge Barrett might strike down the Affordable Care Act, or is it a good thing that shouldn't tarnish her reputation?

Is it a joke that Judge Barrett could curtail women's fundamental rights, or are Republican Senators relieved to think that she thinks Roe v. Wade is judicial imperialism?

Americans are starting to get pretty sick of these double standards and mealy-mouthed talking points—pretty sick of politicians who, just 4 years ago, declared they couldn't possibly confirm a Democratic nominee to the Supreme Court in the early months of an election year but are now rushing to confirm a Republican nominee in the middle of an election that is already underway. Most of all, pretty sick are Republicans claiming they support protections for Americans with preexisting conditions while, at the same time, they support a lawsuit that would eliminate them.

Well, we are about to put a few of these Senate Republicans on the record. Soon, the Senate will vote on a bill that, if passed, would protect the healthcare of hundreds of millions of Americans and prevent efforts by the Department of Justice to advocate that courts strike down the Affordable Care Act. I was able to move this measure to the floor despite the fact that Republicans didn't want it, and now we will have a vote.

Will Republican Senators vote to stop President Trump's Justice Department from spending taxpayer dollars trying to eliminate the taxpayers' healthcare? We will see very shortly.

If Senators truly want to support protections for Americans with preexisting conditions, they would vote to damage President Trump's legal effort to eliminate them. It is as simple as that.

No amount of sophistry or explanation is needed. Yes or no?

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given a chance to finish my remarks in the next few minutes.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Madam President.

It is as simple as that. Are they with the people who want protection or not, or are they standing with President Trump, who wants to destroy it? It is that simple, because if President Trump and the Republican lawsuit are successful, every single American stands to lose vital healthcare protections or access to care. Millions of Americans would see drug costs skyrocket. Tens of millions of families would lose healthcare coverage during the worst health crisis in a century. More than 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions would lose vital protections, including every American who contracted COVID, which would be treated as a preexisting condition. Women would see their country hurtle backward to a time when they could be charged more than men for insurance simply because they are women.

This vote, which I was fortunate enough to obtain, will show America which party stands with protecting Americans' healthcare and protections for preexisting conditions and which party opposes it.

It is plain and simple. Are you with Leader McCONNELL, who wants to rip away people's protections? Are you with President Trump, who wants to wound our American healthcare by eliminating ACA? Are you with the American people, who desperately need these protections? Are you with the mother or father whose son or daughter has cancer and the insurance company says “You are not getting any insurance,” or are you going to require that company to give them the insurance that family so desperately needs?

The eyes of America are on this body and on Republican Senators right now. Whose side are you on—President Trump's or the American people who want healthcare?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Jay Newman, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 551, S. 4653, a bill to protect the healthcare of hundreds of millions of people of the United States and prevent efforts of the Department of Justice to advocate courts to strike down the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Tim Kaine, Martin Heinrich, Jack Reed, Jeff Merkley, Bernard Sanders, Jon Tester, Benjamin L. Cardin, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Angus S. King, Jr., Michael F. Bennet, Edward J. Markey, Chris Van Hollen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 4653, a bill to protect the healthcare of hundreds of millions of people of the United States and prevent efforts of the Department of Justice to advocate courts to strike down the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 200 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Jones	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Sinema
Casey	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	McSally	Udall
Duckworth	Menendez	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Ernst	Murkowski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gardner	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—43

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Loeffler	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Toomey
Crapo	Moran	Wicker
Cruz	Paul	Young
Daines	Perdue	
Enzi	Portman	

NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	Harris	Rubio
Graham	Lee	Tester

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 43.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4756

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk just for a few moments about the internet and social media, and I want to make it clear, first, that I believe firmly in free will and responsibility. I believe that no matter what kind of day you are having or what is going on in your life, that you are responsible for your actions.

But I think we all know, as a matter of experience and common sense, that there are things in this world that can influence our actions. Social media, which I consider to be an American invention, has many virtues and many advantages, and we know that. I think it has brought the world closer today. I think it has given many people a voice. I think it is an extraordinary source of knowledge.

But like other innovations in this world, it has a downside. And one of those downsides is the fact that, too often, social media becomes an endless electronic brawl, and rather than bringing us together and exposing us to other points of view and causing us to test our assumptions against the arguments of others, it brings us apart. I think social media is, in part, responsible for that.

We all know that many social media platforms are free. Let's take Facebook, for example. Facebook is a free service. You open an account; you go on Facebook; and you can find out what your high school friends had for

dinner Saturday night. Now, we give up a lot from that privilege of watching what our high school friends had for dinner Saturday night. Facebook collects an enormous amount of information about us. And, once again, I am not just picking on Facebook. I am using them as an example because it is such a popular platform that we all know about. Facebook uses that information in a number of ways.

First, Facebook uses it to make money. They know a lot of stuff about us from collecting information about us so they can sell advertisers' ads, and they can tailor those ads to the individuals who are on Facebook according to the information that the social media platform—in this case, Facebook—has about them. You can even sell more ads if you can keep people who are on Facebook coming back and coming back and coming back.

So this is what happens. Some see this as a virtue, and some see it as a vice. A social media platform like Facebook gathers an enormous amount of information about us, and they learn, in intricate detail, what motivates us and what our interests are. Another way of saying that would be they learn what our hot buttons are. And they continually show us—what is the word I am looking for—advertisements, information, and postings of other people on Facebook that reinforce our beliefs, and, in some cases, they show us very radical bits of information that really push our hot buttons.

Now, why do they do that? Well, No. 1, it will keep us coming back to Facebook, and it will keep us on Facebook longer, which means that advertisers like us better because we are seeing their ads, and it means that Facebook can sell more ads at a higher price. I am not criticizing them. That is just the way the business works.

But the downside of it is that we only see one point of view. Our point of view is reaffirmed. We never see other points of view. We are never encouraged to question our assumptions or to test our assumptions against the arguments of others.

Now, how does Facebook do this? And, again, I don't mean to just pick on Facebook, but it is an example we are all aware of. They use algorithms. I am not going to try to explain algorithms, but that is how they show us information that pushes our hot buttons.

The social media platforms contend that they are not involved in content and that they are just publishers. So when somebody pushes your hot button and you get angry and you say something that you probably shouldn't say—that is why Facebook has turned into an endless electronic brawl—Facebook says: Hey, it is not our fault. We are just a publisher. That is why, under the law, Facebook enjoys what we call section 230 liability.

But as long as these algorithms are used to push our hot buttons, to reaffirm our points of view, to not show us

other points of view—one point of view is that Facebook and other social media platforms are not just publishers. They are clearly content providers, and they are having an impact on our behavior.

My bill is very simple. It just says that if you are a social media platform and you use algorithms based on the information you, the social media provider, have collected about us, if you use that information to push our hot buttons by continuously showing us information that just reaffirms our point of view without showing us other points of view, that is fine. That is perfectly legal. That is your business model. But in return, you are no longer going to enjoy section 230 liability.

This would not eliminate section 230 liability in a pervasive manner, but it would say that if you are going to use algorithms to push hot buttons and to keep other points of view away from us and monetize that practice, then you shouldn't enjoy section 230 liability. That is all my bill does.

For that reason, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of S. 4756, which is my Don't Push My Buttons Act, to which I just referred, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all in the vein of, we have talked now for years about section 230 liability, and I think we ought to actually try to do something about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this bill is, on its surface, a privacy bill. It appears to have been introduced 2 days ago, and the sponsor has arrived on the floor of the Senate and says that this bill ought to be passed immediately and without debate.

My guess is that a small circle of beltway insiders have seen the text, but I just want the Senator to know that passing this bill this way would just make a mockery of the proposition that we ought to have open, public debate on significant laws. We are dealing with a rush job here.

I will just tell you that based on what we have picked up, the legislation certainly leaves more questions than answers.

First, who does the Senator from Louisiana intend to target with the bill? On a first reading, it could apply to anybody, from Glassdoor, to Spotify, to Cloudflare, to my neighbor's blog, to local media outlets.

At a higher level, if my colleague wants to protect Americans' data from collection and abuse, this bill certainly doesn't do that. On the contrary, his

legislation would push the platforms to simply force users to consent to their data being collected and used as a condition of using their service. That is already being done now, and this bill wouldn't change a thing for Americans' privacy.

Very significantly, our reading is that the Kennedy bill only requires consent if user data is both collected and used by the same company, and it has a massive loophole for data brokers and other shady middlemen who are already compiling dossiers of Americans' sensitive data and selling it to just about anybody with a credit card.

For the last several years, I have been blowing the whistle on these data brokers and these shady middlemen. We have investigated sector after sector where we are seeing these people who really adhere to some of the sleaziest business practices engaging in these tactics where they can get their hands on Americans' sensitive data and basically just sell it to anybody with a credit card.

I guarantee you, there is not a Senator in this body who is going to go home this weekend and tell their constituents: Gee, I want those data brokers and those middlemen to be able to sell my sensitive data to hither and yon, whatever nefarious purposes somebody might want to buy it for.

The Facebooks, the Googles, and the Twitters of the world have all the resources to pay these guys to outsource their data collection and be A-OK. Yet again, as I have said for some time, it is the startups and the little guys who are going to be left behind.

I have been working on these issues since I came to the Senate, and the only person here, really, who knew how to use the computer was the wonderful Senator from Vermont, Senator LEAHY. So as we began to write these formative laws, I said that my interest is the startup and the little guy because the big guys always do great.

That is why, when we were on the floor talking about the change to 230 before, who sold out the little guys? Facebook. And all that happened was the bad guys went off to the dark web.

So this is another bill where the Facebooks and the Googles all have the resources to pay the guys to outsource data collection, as I have been talking about, and the little guy is going to be left behind.

This bill does not require consent to collect your data. It doesn't require consent to use it and follow you around the internet. It wouldn't stop Chinese companies from harvesting American data and selling it to the Chinese Government.

If the Senator from Louisiana wants to protect Americans' sensitive data, I have a bill for doing that. I have comprehensive privacy legislation. It is called the Mind Your Own Business Act. We have been soliciting input on it literally for years. It is the toughest bill in terms of holding the executives actually accountable, for example, if

they lie about their privacy policy, if an executive of one of the major companies, generating billions in revenue, lies about their privacy policy.

The Mind Your Own Business Act is the bill that is the toughest in terms of protecting the consumer. It sets tough privacy and cyber security standards for companies that collect Americans' private data, gives the Federal Trade Commission more authority to issue serious fines, and it is backed up with the strongest enforcement provisions on offer if a CEO lies to the government.

It is not as if you can't write tough privacy proposals. It certainly can be done, and others have ideas on how to do it. But based on everything I have read, and particularly this provision that is going to be a holiday for data brokers and shady middlemen to be able to get people's sensitive data, for all of those reasons and, frankly, others that are too numerous to mention, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 451

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of the first responders in our country. Every day, brave women and men on the frontlines of the COVID-19 pandemic rely on T-Band, a spectrum that makes it possible for them to communicate with each other.

T-Band is the radio frequency that is set aside for these public safety officials so that they can talk to each other to keep all of us safe, all of us healthy. In 11 metropolitan areas, the T-Band system enables our courageous public safety personnel to work quickly and effectively during life-and-death situations.

T-Band allows emergency medical service teams to relay important information about patients' conditions. T-Band permits 9-1-1 dispatchers to send first responders to emergency scenes. Firefighters use T-Band to quickly coordinate strategy.

After the Boston bombing, after the marathon bombing, first responders used T-Band to communicate with each other during the ensuing manhunt.

This resource is nothing short of a lifesaver. T-Band really stands for "trusted band." It is the resource public safety can rely upon.

Unfortunately, the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 required the Federal Communications Commission to begin to auction off the T-Band, the trusted band, by February of 2021, but it would cost between \$5 billion and \$6 billion for first responders—police and fire—to relocate from the T-Band. That is much more money than an auction of that spectrum would ever generate.

Plus, for many first responders, there is simply no alternative to the T-Band; this is their only option. That is why this body must pass the Don't Break

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 Vegans 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?

He said:

For while this year it may be a Catholic against whom the finger of suspicion is pointed, in other years it has been, and may someday be again, a Jew—or a Quaker or a Unitarian or a Baptist. It was Virginia's harassment of Baptist preachers, for example, that helped lead to Jefferson's statute of religious freedom. Today I may be the victim, but tomorrow it may be you—until the whole fabric of our harmonious society is ripped at a time of great national peril.

He made the important point that seems so obvious that he shouldn't have had to make.

He said:

I am not the Catholic candidate for president. I am the Democratic Party's candidate for president, who happens also to be a Catholic.

Finally, he said:

But if this election is decided on the basis that 40 million Americans lost their chance of being president on the day they were baptized, then it is the whole nation that will be the loser—in the eyes of Catholics and non-Catholics around the world, in the eyes of history, and in the eyes of our own people.

Throughout her career, Judge Barrett has impressed the brightest legal minds with her deep understanding of the law and commitment to judicial independence. She made it clear at her hearing 3 years ago that she would be loyal to her oath, and that is to uphold and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States.

It is clear, under the appropriate canons of judicial ethics, that if for some reason a judge can't apply the law because of some personal opinion or conviction, then one needs to disqualify oneself. President Kennedy said that, if it violates your conscience and your faith and you can't reconcile the two, you should resign.

Well, there is just no legitimate reason to question whether Judge Barrett's religious beliefs would make her unfit to serve on the Supreme Court, and I hope our colleagues on the other side will refrain from, once again, imposing a religious test on Judge Barrett as we consider her nomination.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, on another matter, with the school year well underway, I, like, I am sure, many of my colleagues, am continuing to listen to and learn from our teachers and administrators about how this unprecedented school year is unfolding. Whether kicking off the year in person or online or with some hybrid model, educators are facing a whole new range of challenges that have made the past several weeks anything but ordinary.

Over August, I spent some time talking to kindergarten through 12th grade teachers and students to learn how they were preparing to overcome the hurdles brought on by this pandemic. I also visited our colleges and universities to see how they were handling the start of the new year, and since then, I have stayed in close contact with all of them to learn more about how it is proceeding.

Our college campuses, for example, in most cases, are home to more than just classrooms and libraries. They are whole communities unto themselves with student housing, offices, dining facilities, gyms, convenience stores, and with, in some cases, full-service utility companies.

Lee Tyner, who serves as general counsel for Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, testified before the Judiciary Committee earlier this year and compared running a campus to leading a small city. You have a vast set of responsibilities that extend far beyond the education you are providing to your students, and those responsibilities have only grown more challenging during the pandemic.

Back in July, I spoke with some of the chancellors of our public colleges and universities to learn more about how they were preparing to deal with the immense challenges higher education was facing, and last Friday, I was able to catch up and see how things had gone—whether they had gone according to plan or whether they had encountered problems they had not been able to anticipate.

I learned about the University of Texas System's comprehensive plan to keep students and staff safe at each of their campuses across the State, which involves a serious testing infrastructure. Four institutions have built labs on their own campuses to conduct the testing that is necessary, and each has the capacity to test between 500 and 2,000 people each day. Other campuses are partnering with the UT Health Science Center institutions for their own testing, and these are providing a no-out-of-pocket cost testing opportunity for students, faculty, and staff.

The University of North Texas System has reopened campuses with a mix of in-person, online, and hybrid instruction, and it has been very effective at stopping the transmission of the virus. If a student or any close relative tests positive, there are clear guidelines for isolating and then contact tracing to minimize the spread.

When I spoke last week with the chancellors, UNT had only 27 active cases on campus, and it has seen no evidence of COVID-19 transmission in the classrooms or buildings where they conduct face-to-face activities.

This is the trend most campuses are seeing. There is a low to zero transmission rate in classrooms, thanks to these preparations and these precautions. The biggest risk to students, staff, and the surrounding communities actually comes from off-campus activities or people who bring it onto the campus who are not part of that student body or administration.

In Texas and States across the country, we have seen news articles about how off-campus parties and gatherings have been linked to clusters of these new cases. Appropriately, the universities have cracked down on these campus groups or individuals hosting those events, and they are trying to do what

they can to identify them and then stop the spread.

John Sharp, who is the chancellor of the Texas A&M University System, talked about one unconventional way that A&M is trying to pinpoint potential outbreaks as soon as possible.

A&M has adopted the practice of wastewater surveillance, which has been used for years as a way to detect viruses or diseases within a community. Now it is being used to find the source of individual COVID-19 cases or clusters of cases in student housing, particularly dormitories. The university takes wastewater samples from sewage systems on campus, and a positive test allows them to then go back and target individuals for testing.

Obviously, if there is no virus detected, they know there is no need for that conditional testing, at least at this time. This practice can help to detect an outbreak at a dorm that can otherwise go unnoticed for several days and, thus, be spread far and wide.

Our colleges and universities across the State have gone to great lengths to manage the crisis that did not come with a manual. They have implemented the best practices to protect the health and safety of students and staff members and to ensure that their students have access to a quality education, which is the very purpose for which they exist.

In our conversation last week, these chancellors told me how helpful the CARES Act funding has been over the last several months, and they reiterated that they need more help. They need Congress to come together and provide more help. It is not just colleges and universities. It is also our elementary, middle, and high schools.

Congress has already provided more than \$30 billion in emergency relief for education, including \$2.6 billion in Texas alone. This funding has gone a long way to prepare for this school year and to allow these leaders to manage the risks associated with the spread of the virus.

They say they need more help, and it is incredibly frustrating that, despite this being a bipartisan goal and something we were able to do together in four separate bills, we have now been unable to pass another relief bill to give our schools and our children the resources they need in order to be safe. You would think this would be a priority.

The two House proposals we have seen—one of which passed the House earlier this year and the other of which was introduced last week—did include additional funding for education, and a bill we proposed over the summer included another \$105 billion for education—more than tripling the investment that has already been made in the CARES Act.

History has proven that legislation gets harder to do the closer we get to an election, and perhaps nothing is better evidence of that than where we find

ourselves today, but the need for additional help should transcend those partisan differences.

I spoke to Secretary Mnuchin less than an hour ago, and he continues talking to Speaker PELOSI, but at some point, while talking is good—it is better than not talking—sometimes it is important not just to talk but to actually do something. In this case, that would mean the House and the Senate working with the President to agree on another bill. So I hope we are at a point at which we can see some relief soon.

I am thinking about the airline industry and the tens of thousands of airline employees who are being furloughed, actually, starting today. American Airlines and Southwest Airlines are headquartered in my State. I know, through no fault of their own, the airlines are struggling. We have tried to help them, and we have helped them, but we need to help the airlines' employees by providing them with more assistance during this challenging time. We can do that if we would get off of dead center and work out some mutually agreeable compromise.

Nobody is going to get everything one wants. It is not the nature of life or the nature of this business, but the American people are depending on us to do our jobs, and we cannot let them down.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

BLACK REVOLUTIONARY WAR PATRIOTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, America's founding principles, including that all men are created equal and endowed by our Creator with unalienable rights, are timeless and apply equally to all Americans.

Commitment to these founding principles is what ties us together as Americans, so it is vital that all Americans feel connected to them.

That is why I have been working for years to establish a memorial on the National Mall to those Black Revolutionary War patriots who fought for our founding ideals.

I commend to all Americans the insights of the founder of the organization working to build this memorial, who argues that these patriots' service and sacrifice completed the Founders' vision.

(At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I was absent due to an urgent family matter requiring my attention when the Senate voted on vote No. 200 on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 551, S. 4653. On vote No. 200, had I been present, I would have voted yea. •

YOM KIPPUR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Rabbi Michael Cohen is a longtime friend of Marcelle and me. He occasionally sends me a Sunday sermon, which I thoroughly enjoy and share with family members. Following a week of mourning the passing of Justice Ginsburg, it was comforting to have this sermon to read after church this last Sunday.

I ask unanimous consent that this sermon be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Jerusalem Post, Sept. 24, 2020]

THE ECHOES OF YOM KIPPUR

(By Rabbi Michael M. Cohen)

When the gates of heaven close during the Ne'ila service of Yom Kippur, many of us put the avodah, the work, of Yom Kippur behind us. But that is an illusion. As the expression goes, when one door closes, another opens.

Commentating on the Kol Nidre service at the beginning of Yom Kippur, when the gates are open wide, Rabbi Max Arzt teaches the goal of Yom Kippur is, "to lessen the distance between what we are and what we ought to be."

If the long day of introspection has worked, then at Ne'ila those gates close on who we were and open to a lighter, better and more refined version of who we are.

But that too is an illusion. It is a fleeting moment of personal triumph. Like the sunset that gives way to the night, the dawn to the morning, the moon and its phases, the high tide and the low tide; stasis is not derech haolam, the way of the world.

Each morning the siddur, the prayer book, reminds us, "Day after day You renew creation." In that unfolding story we are, truth be told, composed of stardust. Most of the elements of our bodies originated in stars and the Big Bang.

Like the rest of the universe, our course is one of continual renewal. Yom Kippur highlights that awareness and the work we began on Rosh Hodesh Elul, the beginning of the month of Elul, 40 days earlier. Our work reaches a higher level on Rosh Hashanah and the Ten Days of Repentance, aseret yomei teshuva, culminating with Yom Kippur.

Those 40 days parallel the period when Moses returned to Mount Sinai to receive

the second set of tablets following the incident of the Golden Calf. Moses, Moshe rabbeinu, Moses our teacher, literally models teshuva, repentance, return, when after the first tablets lay shattered at his feet he turned around and returned to once again climb Mount Sinai.

We are no different, as the echo of Yom Kippur is always with us, pushing us to climb the mountain all year long. Yom Kippur Katan, the small Yom Kippur, observed by some in most months on the day preceding Rosh Hodesh, is one of those echoes. It includes a daylight-hours' fast and special liturgy.

Rabbi Shefa Gold elucidates the origins of Yom Kippur Katan, teaching, "Kabbalists were moon watchers. The lenses through which they gazed were intensely focused on issues of exile and redemption. And so as the moon waned, the exile of the Shechina (the Divine Presence) was noted and mourned.

With the moon's return came the celebration of the miracle of redemption, a redemption that could be tasted and known but briefly before the cycle of exile continued. They based their custom on a legend that was recorded in the Babylonian Talmud in which God says to Israel, "Bring atonement upon me for making the moon smaller." (Hullin 60b) THAT EPISODE in the Talmud is fascinating in and of itself. There God admits after God made the moon smaller than the sun that God had wronged the moon, and because of that God needed to do teshuva! Implied within that radical text: If God can admit to wrongdoing and address transgression, who are we not to?

In addition to Yom Kippur Katan, another echo of Yom Kippur is the sixth paragraph of the weekday Amidah prayer. There we say the confessional selach lanu, forgive us, in the same manner that we say the confessional prayers ashamnu and al chet of Yom Kippur. Interspersed within the al chet Yom Kippur liturgy itself we also say selach lanu as we do during the rest of the year: "Ve'al kulam eloha selichot selach lanu. Mechal lanu. Kaper lanu." And for them all, God of forgiveness, please forgive, pardon us, help us atone." The selach lanu paragraph follows the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the Amidah. We first ask for binah, understanding, including self-understanding, so we can ask in the next prayer for help with teshuvah, repentance. There is a logic within the order of the Amidah: first self-understanding followed by repentance, and only then forgiveness.

Three times a day the weekday Amidah is said. This means three times a day—evening, morning, and afternoon—we ask for forgiveness. In Judaism there is the concept of not saying a bracha levatala, a blessing whose purpose is not going to be fulfilled. This means that when we ask for forgiveness throughout the day there is the implied understanding, since we can't say the bracha in vain, that we did something wrong in the morning, afternoon and evening.

For some this is proof Judaism is a religion of guilt. Rabbi Art Green teaches the opposite when he says that Judaism is actually about guilt relief. This system provides us precious moments throughout the day to check in with ourselves and recalibrate as needed.

Elaborating, Rabbi Daniel Kamesar, z"l (of blessed memory), looks to the past daily sacrificial system of the Temple in Jerusalem as a model for that guilt relief when we would bring a chatat or an asham offering as expiation for our wrong choices, for missing the mark. Watching the smoke rise heavenly could be a cathartic, like watching the breadcrumbs of the Tashlich service float downstream away from us.

"Burn it up and let it go," Daniel points out. "Most therapists are trying desperately to help us achieve that."

While we are talking about the echoes of Yom Kippur throughout the year, we also note on Yom Kippur itself we have echoes of the Temple service. The chatat offering became the al chet prayer, and the ashram offering became the ashamu of the Yom Kippur liturgy.

One of the most profound moments in our daily prayer life emanates from the Ne'ila service. The Talmud (Yoma 87b) discusses the wording for the service. Shmuel and Ulla bar Rav suggest we say, "What are we? What is our life? What is our kindness? What is our righteousness? What is our salvation? What is our power? What is our might?" THOSE QUESTIONS eventually migrated into the daily morning prayers of the siddur. In the context of the Talmud and the siddur they are traditionally understood as questions arising from a sense of "our iniquities too many to count," as Rav Judah states.

However, they can also be read as seven existential questions addressing the essence of our lives. We start by asking, "What are we?" The ultimate question, but in some ways too immense to answer, and so we fine tune and arrive at, "What is our life?" That is to say, what do we do with our lives, this precious gift? We want to define who we are. To answer that question, we realize our lives are measured by how we treat others, and so we ask, "What is our kindness?" and "What is our righteousness?" In other words, what care and consideration do we bring to others, and in a broader social reach, how do we strengthen justice in our communities and the world?

Our lives are also measured and grounded by our inner spiritual lives, and so we ask, "What is our salvation?" Answering and living by the answers to these questions takes energy, and so we conclude by asking, "What is our power? What is our might?"

While they are the final questions, they are both cautionary, giving us pause to think how we use our strength and efficacy while at the same time reminding us that we have agency.

There is another lesson with these questions. Only the first two actually appear in the Talmud. As the scholar of Jewish liturgy Lawrence Hoffman points out, "Frequently, prayers were ad libbed. They began with a starting point, like Mah anu? Mah chayeinu? What are we? What is our life? But they then moved in whatever direction the prayer leader preferred. It could be made up on the spot. What was done one year would not have been the same as in later years. There were no "right" and "wrong" as we think of them.

"Right" was just making up the prayer and delivering it on the proper theme, with, ideally, some biblical texts to support the idea. Congregants would recognize the biblical support and nod in recognition. So the Talmudic writer of this section might have had his own practice in mind, or no practice in mind at all, other than the idea that we start with the citation in question, and then develop the theme in a way that makes sense at the time.

Such a process invites us to go deeper than the printed words on the page of the siddur. It asks us to drink from the essence of its message. What a liberating, creative, empowering approach; an approach with immense responsibility as well.

Ne'ila metaphorically suggests the gates of heaven close at the end of Yom Kippur, while at the same time we remember those daily Yom Kippur touch points and messages throughout the year. They remind us throughout the year that we always have the gift and opportunity to improve who we are, as well as to repair our shared world.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 20-17 concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Egypt for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$417 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

HEIDI H. GRANT,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 20-17

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Egypt.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$0 million.
Other \$417 million.
TOTAL \$417 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
None.

Non-MDE: A Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA) system that includes multi-site Acquisition Radars (fixed and mobile) with supporting facilities, Electro-Optical/Infrared Sensors (fixed, mobile, airborne), Radio Communications suites, Hybrid Power Generation Systems, Closed Circuit Television, Power and Data Distribution Units, Automatic Identification System, and various other surveillance and communications systems; and other related elements of logistical and program support. Equipment includes: thirty-four (34) Integrated Fixed Towers with supporting equipment; twenty-eight (28) Communication Towers with supporting equipment; twelve (12) Relay Towers with supporting equipment; six (6) Naval Base Operations Rooms, two (2) regional Operations Centers, and one (1) Strategic Operation Center all with supporting equipment; six (6) Harbor Protection Systems with sup-

porting equipment; Intelligent Fiber Intrusion Detection System; twelve (12) Vertical Take Off and Landing UAV with six (6) Ground Stations; fourteen (14) Mobile Maritime Surveillance Vehicles; and, three (3) Aerostat ISR Integrated Platform with supporting equipment.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (EG-P-LGQ).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: EG-D-DAB.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 1, 2020.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Egypt—Maritime Domain Awareness System

The Government of Egypt has requested a possible sale of a Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA) system that includes multi-site Acquisition Radars (fixed and mobile) with supporting facilities, Electro-Optical/Infrared Sensors (fixed, mobile, airborne), Radio Communications suites, Hybrid Power Generation Systems, Closed Circuit Television, Power and Data Distribution Units, Automatic Identification System, and various other surveillance and communications systems; and other related elements of logistical and program support. Equipment includes: thirty-four (34) Integrated Fixed Towers with supporting equipment; twenty-eight (28) Communication Towers with supporting equipment; twelve (12) Relay Towers with supporting equipment; six (6) Naval Base Operations Rooms, two (2) regional Operations Centers, and one (1) Strategic Operation Center all with supporting equipment; six (6) Harbor Protection Systems with supporting equipment; Intelligent Fiber Intrusion Detection System; twelve (12) Vertical Take Off and Landing UAV with six (6) Ground Stations; fourteen (14) Mobile Maritime Surveillance Vehicles; and, three (3) Aerostat ISR Integrated Platform with supporting equipment. The estimated total program cost is \$417 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a Major Non-NATO Ally country that continues to be an important strategic partner in the Middle East.

Egypt intends to use this Maritime Domain Awareness system to provide the Egyptian Armed Forces with a maritime surveillance capability with real-time situational awareness in the defense of Egypt maritime boundary, natural resources, and ports. Egypt will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be the Advanced Technology Systems Company (ATSC), McLean, VA. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require annual trips to Egypt involving U.S. Government and contractor representatives for technical reviews, support, and oversight for approximately five years.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act

requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 20-60 concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Republic of Korea for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$158.1 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

HEIDI H. GRANT,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 20-60

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Republic of Korea.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$135.9 million.
Other \$22.2 million.
Total \$158.1 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
One hundred fifteen (115) AIM-9X Block II Tactical Sidewinder Missiles.

Fifty (50) AIM-9X Block II Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM).

Twenty (20) AIM-9X Block II Tactical Missile Guidance Units.

Twenty (20) AIM-9X Block II CATM Guidance Units.

Non-MDE:

Also included are containers, weapon system support, software, surface transportation, missile technical assistance, and other technical assistance; and other related elements of program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (KS-P-AMV).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: KS-P-ALE.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 1, 2020.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Korea—AIM-9X Block II Tactical Sidewinder Missiles

The Republic of Korea has requested to buy one hundred fifteen (115) AIM-9X Block II Tactical Sidewinder missiles; fifty (50) AIM-9X Block II Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM); twenty (20) AIM-9X Block II Tactical Missile Guidance Units; and twenty (20) AIM-9X Block II CATM Guidance Units. Also included are containers, weapon system support, software, surface transportation, missile technical assistance, and other technical assistance; and other related elements of program support. The estimated total cost is \$158.1 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a treaty ally that continues to be an important force for political stability, peace, and economic progress in North East Asia.

The proposed sale will assist the Republic of Korea in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability. The Republic of Korea will have no difficulty absorbing these missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Corporation, Tucson, AZ. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to the Republic of Korea.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 20-60

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AIM-9X Block II SIDEWINDER Missile is a short-range, air-to-air missile. The AIM-9X Block II SIDEWINDER Missile provides a high off-boresight seeker, enhanced countermeasure rejection capability, low drag/high angle of attack airframe and the ability to integrate the Helmet Mounted Cueing System. The software algorithms are the most sensitive portion of the AIM-9X missile. The software continues to be modified via a pre-planned product improvement (P³I) program in order to improve its counter-countermeasure capabilities. No software source code or algorithms will be released.

2. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that the Republic of Korea can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Republic of Korea.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I don't think I am overstating the severity of the situation when I say that this past week has been one of the most chaotic and divisive in our Nation's history. The American people met the news of Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's death with an outpouring of sympathy; but, of course, rather than let an opportunity go to waste, radicals and activists, fueled by the same hatred that still fills our streets with violence, emerged from the shadows and exploited a nation's grief.

Rarely—or perhaps, never before—in the history of this country have the so-called progressive movement, the activist left, and even some members of the Senate minority worked so tirelessly to scare the American people into submission.

Their willingness to use differences in family, religion, and personal morality to impugn the integrity and competence of Supreme Court Associate Justice nominee Judge Amy Coney Barrett without giving her the benefit of even a single conversation shocks the conscience. It is a scandal beneath the dignity of this body.

In the coming weeks, I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to meet with Judge Barrett, as I did today. I think you will find that she is not trying to get off easy. As a fellow conservative woman who cherishes a deep faith and commitment to family, I can assure you, she has already been tested by fire and passed with flying colors.

ONLINE FREEDOM AND VIEWPOINT DIVERSITY ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation subpoenaed testimony from Mr. Jack Dorsey of Twitter, Mr. Sundar Pichai of Alphabet, Inc., and Mr. Mark Zuckerberg of Facebook.

I supported the issuance of these subpoenas, and I look forward to hearing testimony on the content moderation policies used by their respective platforms.

Over the past few months, I have worked with many members of this body on a statutory fix to section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, specifically to the ingrained liability shield that platforms like Facebook use to defend their content moderation policies. Over the years, we have seen Big Tech's biggest players stretch this shield beyond all recognition, far beyond the limits Congress envisioned when they passed the original act in 1996.

Now, content moderators wield their power with abandon, banning and deleting content they disagree with right alongside content of the most vile, universally repulsive nature. Last month,

in response to growing outcries over censorship, I introduced the Online Freedom and Viewpoint Diversity Act with Chairman LINDSEY GRAHAM and Chairman ROGER WICKER to introduce accountability into our dealings with digital platforms and services.

This bill is unique because it doesn't do specifically what so many here in Washington would like it to do: It doesn't delete section 230 from the U.S. Code, nor does it put the power to decide what information should and should not be available online in Congress's or regulators' hands. All it does is remove ambiguities from the original statutory language to help companies and consumers better understand when that liability shield is and is not applicable.

Still, as we move forward with legislation, it is important to remember that we are creating policy for the internet we have now and will have in the future and not the internet we had back in 1996, hence the reason for the subpoenas we are sending to those three Silicon Valley executives. They are the ones who created the internet we have today, and their justifications and perspectives regarding the future of content moderation could prove useful. Subpoenas do change the tone of the conversation, but we view this as a rare opportunity to glean both insight and accountability from the tech industry.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK CALVELLI

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the career of an outstanding civil servant, Mr. Frank Calvelli, who is one of my constituents. Mr. Calvelli recently announced his plan to retire after 34 years of government service, most recently as the Principal Deputy Director for the National Reconnaissance Office, where he has provided commendable leadership and operational management for the past 8 years. Mr. Calvelli will complete his government service at the end of this year.

During Frank's 30-year tenure at the NRO, he has been responsible for leading various internal organizations and overseeing the acquisition and operation of many of our Nation's most vital overhead reconnaissance assets. These platforms perform essential intelligence collection roles to better inform U.S. Government and allied partner nation defense policies and deter potential aggressors. Frank contributed to 11-plus-years of consecutive clean financial audits, an unequaled record within the U.S. intelligence community. Mr. Calvelli has played an important role developing a permanent employee cadre and leading the more than 3,000 people who work at the NRO. When called upon in 2019 to take on the responsibility of acting in the capacity of the Director, he often testified on behalf of the NRO before Congress and specifically the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

While Mr. Calvelli has shouldered the responsibility of overseeing large, complex government acquisition programs, his fondest memories will be of the NRO's people. Like any successful organization, the NRO relies on its talented and skilled workforce to accomplish its national security mission. Their wellbeing and success have always been a top priority for him, and it is especially important that the women and men of the NRO have leadership that backs them in their primary imperative as intelligence professionals: to speak truth to power.

I also understand that Frank's love of NASCAR is well known at the NRO. I, too, share an appreciation of NASCAR and hope he has greater opportunities to enjoy racing and more time with his family. On behalf of a grateful nation, as he transitions to future opportunities, I would like to publicly thank Mr. Calvelli for his valuable contributions to the Nation and our national security, and I personally thank the Calvelli family for their critical role in supporting him throughout his service to the Nation.

TRIBUTE TO ROBINSON DESROCHES

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor one of Louisville's finest, Louisville Metro Police Officer Robinson Desroches. Police work is an unquestionably difficult and dangerous job, but it is among the noblest callings. Each and every day, officers risk their lives to keep our communities safe. Officers such as Louisville Metro Police Officer Robinson Desroches meet the challenges they encounter every day with professionalism, class, and courage. Officer Desroches joined the LMPD in 2019. Serving to keep the peace in Louisville during a time of uncertainty, Officer Desroches has served his community with class and courage during this difficult time. Dedicated service from officers like Officer Desroches during times of protest is important to keep protests peaceful instead of a riot. Officer Desroches and his fellow officers deserve and have our respect and admiration. Officer Desroches was shot on Wednesday night during the protest in Louisville. Fortunately, he is expected to make a full recovery. I join my fellow Kentuckians in wishing Officer Desroches a speedy recovery.

TRIBUTE TO AUBREY GREGORY

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor one of Louisville's finest, Louisville Metro Police Major Aubrey Gregory. Police work is an unquestionably difficult and dangerous job, but it is among the noblest callings. Each and every day, officers risk their lives to keep our communities safe. Officers such as Louisville Metro Police Major Aubrey Gregory meet the challenges they encounter every day with professionalism, class,

and courage. Major Gregory joined the LMPD in 1999 and leads Louisville Metro Police Special Operations Unit. Serving to keep the peace in Louisville during a time of uncertainty, Major Gregory has led his fellow officers with class and courage during this difficult time. Dedicated service from officers like Major Gregory during times of protest is important to keep protests peaceful instead of a riot. Major Gregory and his fellow officers deserve and have our respect and admiration. Major Gregory was shot on Wednesday night during the protest in Louisville. Fortunately, Major Gregory is expected to make a full recovery. I join my fellow Kentuckians in wishing Major Gregory a speedy recovery.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE MAGIC CITY DISCOVERY CENTER

• Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I recognize today the city of Minot, the Minot Air Force Base, and other community members who have come together to present their youngest citizens a gift they will enjoy for generations to come.

Groundbreaking will be held on October 7 for the Magic City Discovery Center, a children's museum that will develop 12 interactive galleries on math, engineering, technology, science, and art for children up to 14 years old. The museum will encourage children of all ages to learn both independently and in groups as they invent, play, discover, and create.

Making this center a reality has been a significant challenge to its supporters, and only with many partners could the nearly \$14 million in construction costs be met. A large boost came from the Minot Air Force Base, which worked with the community to secure a \$6.3 million grant from the Defense Community Infrastructure Pilot Program. This Department of Defense program helps fund projects that prioritize quality of life for Active military families. The commanders of the Minot Air Force Base supported this grant so their more than 1,300 children of military families from kindergarten through fifth grade have year-round learning opportunities.

I congratulate the city of Minot and Minot Air Force Base on another successful community partnership. The men and women stationed at the base perform exemplary work every day critical to the safety of our Nation. We must do all we can to support them and their families during their time as North Dakota residents.

North Dakota's quality of life is consistently ranked as one of the best in the Nation. An excellent example of why we have this high ranking is the dedication of the citizens of Minot to give their children a Magic City Discovery Center.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

TRANSMITTING AS OUTLINED IN THE ENCLOSED LIST OF ACCOUNTS—PM 60

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 114(b) of division A of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2021 and Other Extensions Act (H.R. 8337; the "Act"), I hereby designate as emergency requirements all funding (including the rescission of funds) so designated by the Congress in the Act pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as outlined in the enclosed list of accounts.

The details of this action are set forth in the enclosed memorandum from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 1, 2020.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

TRANSMITTING AS OUTLINED IN THE ENCLOSED LIST OF ACCOUNTS—PM 61

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 114(b) of division A of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2021 and Other Extensions Act (H.R. 8337; the "Act"), I hereby designate for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism all funding (including the rescission of funds) so designated by the Congress in the Act pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as outlined in the enclosed list of accounts.

The details of this action are set forth in the enclosed memorandum from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 1, 2020.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, an-

nounced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2454. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 East Sharpfish Street in Rosebud, South Dakota, as the "Ben Reifel Post Office Building".

H.R. 3005. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13308 Midland Road in Poway, California, as the "Ray Chavez Post Office Building".

H.R. 3680. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 415 North Main Street in Henning, Tennessee, as the "Paula Croom Robinson and Judy Spray Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 4725. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8585 Criterion Drive in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "Chaplain (Capt.) Dale Goetz Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 4764. An act to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4875. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2201 E. Maple Street in North Canton, Ohio, as the "Lance Cpl. Stacy 'Annie' Dryden Post Office".

H.R. 4971. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 East Market Street in Leesburg, Virginia, as the "Norman Duncan Post Office Building".

H.R. 5307. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 115 Nicol Avenue in Thomasville, Alabama, as the "Postmaster Robert Ingram Post Office".

H.R. 5736. An act to direct the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security to develop and disseminate a threat assessment regarding threats to the United States associated with foreign violent white supremacist extremist organizations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5780. An act to enhance stakeholder outreach to and operational engagement with owners and operators of critical infrastructure and other relevant stakeholders by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to bolster security against acts of terrorism and other homeland security threats, including by maintaining a clearinghouse of security guidance, best practices, and other voluntary content developed by the Agency or aggregated from trusted sources, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5804. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the Blue Campaign of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5811. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to provide nursing facilities and paid parental leave for Administration personnel, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5822. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish an acquisition professional career program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5823. An act to establish a program to make grants to States to address cybersecurity risks and cybersecurity threats to information systems of State, local, Tribal, or territorial governments, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5901. An act to establish a program to facilitate the adoption of modern technology by executive agencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5954. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 West Maple Street in Holly, Michigan, as the "Holly Veterans Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 5987. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 909 West Holiday Drive in Fate, Texas, as the "Ralph Hall Post Office".

H.R. 5988. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in 2600 Wesley Street in Greenville, Texas, as the "Audie Murphy Post Office Building".

H.R. 6270. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers to make certain disclosures relating to the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7340. An act to ensure that personal protective equipment and other equipment and supplies needed to fight coronavirus are provided to employees required to return to Federal offices, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7496. An act to require Federal agencies to submit plans for responding to any resurgence of COVID-19, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1011c, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for a term of 6 years: Upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader: Dr. Arthur E. Keiser of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, Ms. Jennifer Blum of Washington, DC, Mr. Robert G. Mayes, Jr., of Elberta, Alabama; Upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader: Ms. Kathleen Sullivan Alioto of New York, New York, Mr. Robert Shireman of Berkeley, California, Dr. Roslyn Clark Artis of Columbia, South Carolina.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2454. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 East Sharpfish Street in Rosebud, South Dakota, as the "Ben Reifel Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3005. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13308 Midland Road in Poway, California, as the "Ray Chavez Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3680. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 415 North Main Street in Henning, Tennessee, as the "Paula Croom Robinson and Judy Spray Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4725. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8585 Criterion Drive in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "Chaplain (Capt.) Dale Goetz Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4875. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2201 E. Maple Street in North Canton, Ohio, as the "Lance Cpl. Stacy 'Annie' Dryden Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4971. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 East Market Street in Leesburg, Virginia, as the "Norman Duncan Post Office

Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5307. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 115 Nicol Avenue in Thomasville, Alabama, as the "Postmaster Robert Ingram Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5736. An act to direct the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security to develop and disseminate a threat assessment regarding threats to the United States associated with foreign violent white supremacist extremist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5780. An act to enhance stakeholder outreach to and operational engagement with owners and operators of critical infrastructure and other relevant stakeholders by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to bolster security against acts of terrorism and other homeland security threats, including by maintaining a clearinghouse of security guidance, best practices, and other voluntary content developed by the Agency or aggregated from trusted sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5804. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the Blue Campaign of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5811. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to provide nursing facilities and paid parental leave for Administration personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5822. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish an acquisition professional career program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5823. An act to establish a program to make grants to States to address cybersecurity risks and cybersecurity threats to information systems of State, local, Tribal, or territorial governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5954. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 West Maple Street in Holly, Michigan, as the "Holly Veterans Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6270. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers to make certain disclosures relating to the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 7340. An act to ensure that personal protective equipment and other equipment and supplies needed to fight coronavirus are provided to employees required to return to Federal offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 7496. An act to require Federal agencies to submit plans for responding to any resurgence of COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. 4433. A bill to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 4773. A bill to establish the Paycheck Protection Program Second Draw Loan, and for other purposes.

S. 4774. A bill to provide support for air carrier workers, and for other purposes.

S. 4775. A bill to provide continued emergency assistance, educational support, and health care response for individuals, families, and businesses affected by the 2020 coronavirus pandemic.

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5987. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 909 West Holiday Drive in Fate, Texas, as the "Ralph Hall Post Office".

H.R. 5988. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2600 Wesley Street in Greenville, Texas, as the "Audie Murphy Post Office Building".

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5602. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the administration of Workplace and Gender Relations Surveys; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5603. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5604. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Postmarketing Safety Reports for Approved New Animal Drugs; Electronic Submission Requirements; Correction" (RIN0910-AH51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5605. A communication from the Chief of Negotiations and Restructuring, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification that the Corporation has issued an order partitioning the Bricklayers and Allied Craftsmen Local 7 Pension Plan pursuant to section 4233 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended; to the Committees on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; and Finance.

EC-5606. A communication from the General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2020 Annual Report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5607. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Justice, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5608. A communication from the Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a legislative proposal relative to modernizing and clarifying the immunity that 47 U.S.C. section 230 provides to online platforms that host and moderate content; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

POM-243. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to credit history and employment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1046. A bill to establish the Office of Internet Connectivity and Growth, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-274).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments:

S. 2203. A bill to extend the transfer of Electronic Travel Authorization System fees from the Travel Promotion Fund to the Corporation for Travel Promotion (Brand USA) through fiscal year 2027, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-275).

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

S. 4138. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make permanent the authority of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to conduct a telework travel expenses program (Rept. No. 116-276).

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

S. 4200. A bill to establish a program to facilitate the adoption of modern technology by executive agencies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-277).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 4778. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the use of security cameras in medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 4779. A bill to authorize additional district judges for the district courts and convert temporary judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for qualified Hurricane Laura recovery opportunity zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MERKLEY)):

S. 4781. A bill to direct the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to issue an occupational safety and health standard to protect workers from heat-related injuries and illnesses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 4782. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to improve indoor air quality in elementary schools and secondary schools in response to the COVID-19 public health emergency using proven technologies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 4783. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for economic activity in possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 4784. A bill to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4785. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to develop a model for risk-based budgeting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 4786. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to, and take into trust for the benefit of, the Burns Paiute Tribe certain land in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 4787. A bill to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 4788. A bill to prohibit States and localities that seek to impede the free formation of education pods from receiving Federal emergency education funds, to provide a teacher expense deduction for home educators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 4789. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide funding to States for extending broadband service to unserved areas in partnership with broadband service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4790. A bill to improve the ability of separating or retiring members of the Armed Forces to seek services provided by accredited veterans service officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 4791. A bill to provide for a Community-Based Emergency and Non-Emergency Response Grant Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 4792. A bill to extend the availability of Coronavirus Relief Fund payment funds for States or governments that use such funds to respond to the COVID-19 public health emer-

gency in accordance with a qualifying economic development plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 4793. A bill to authorize the imposition of sanctions with respect to certain activities that threaten the national security, foreign policy, public health, economic health, or financial stability of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 4794. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the COVID-19 Telehealth Program of the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

S. 4795. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a voluntary Cyber Sense program to test the cybersecurity of products and technologies intended for use in the bulk-power system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. REED, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. Res. 742. A resolution designating September 2020 as "National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 743. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Month, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles, increasing personal financial literacy, and engaging the people of the United States on the keys to success in achieving and maintaining retirement security throughout their lifetimes; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 744. A resolution congratulating the National Federation of Federal Employees on the celebration of its 51st Convention on October 5, 2020, and recognizing the vital contributions to the United States made by the members of the National Federation of Federal Employees for 103 years; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. Kaine):

S. Res. 745. A resolution honoring the life, legacy, and example of former Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin on the 25th anniversary of his death; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 578

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 1125

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

S. 1163

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1163, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs.

S. 2815

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2815, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Honor Mission.

S. 2981

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2981, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 3190

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3190, a bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism.

S. 3471

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3471, a bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang

Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3471, *supra*.

S. 3595

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3595, a bill to require a longitudinal study on the impact of COVID-19.

S. 4106

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4106, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for hospital and insurer price transparency.

S. 4150

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4150, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide assistance to certain providers of transportation services affected by the novel coronavirus.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4150, *supra*.

S. 4166

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4166, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to secure medical opinions for veterans with service-connected disabilities who die from COVID-19 to determine whether their service-connected disabilities were the principal or contributory cases of death, and for other purposes.

S. 4272

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4272, a bill to advance a policy for managed strategic competition with the People's Republic of China.

S. 4384

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4384, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to address exposure by members of the Armed Forces to toxic substances at Karshi-Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan, and for other purposes.

S. 4453

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4453, a bill to protect the continuity of the food supply chain of the United States in response to COVID-19, and for other purposes.

S. 4548

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Penn-

sylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4548, a bill to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on global basic education programs.

S. 4609

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4609, a bill to withdraw normal trade relations treatment from, and apply certain provisions of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 to, products of the People's Republic of China, and to expand the eligibility requirements for products of the People's Republic of China to receive normal trade relations treatment in the future, and for other purposes.

S. 4634

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4634, a bill to provide support for air carrier workers, and for other purposes.

S. 4694

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4694, a bill to extend and expand limitations on the importation of uranium from the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 4708

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4708, a bill to establish a commission to review certain regulatory obstacles to preparedness for, response to, and recovery from the Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 pandemic and other pandemics, and for other purposes.

S. 4730

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 4730, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue quarter dollars in commemoration of the Nineteenth Amendment, and for other purposes.

S. 4757

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 4757, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to establish additional requirements for dealers, and for other purposes.

S. 4765

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4765, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the inclusion of certain personally identifying information from the informa-

tion furnished to promotion selection boards for commissioned officers of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 684

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 684, a resolution calling on the Government of Cameroon and separatist armed groups from the English-speaking Northwest and Southwest regions to end all violence, respect the human rights of all Cameroonians, and pursue a genuinely inclusive dialogue toward resolving the ongoing civil conflict in Anglophone Cameroon.

S. RES. 689

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 689, a resolution condemning the crackdown on peaceful protestors in Belarus and calling for the imposition of sanctions on responsible officials.

S. RES. 701

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 701, a resolution urging the Government of Burma to hold free, fair, inclusive, transparent, participatory, and credible elections on November 8, 2020.

S. RES. 709

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 709, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the August 13, 2020, and September 11, 2020, announcements of the establishment of full diplomatic relations between the State of Israel and the United Arab Emirates and the State of Israel and the Kingdom of Bahrain are historic achievements.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 742—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2020 AS “NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. REED, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 742

Whereas each year more than 15,700 children in the United States, and more than 300,000 children under the age of 19 globally, are diagnosed with cancer;

Whereas every year more than 1,700 children in the United States, and 328,000 children under the age of 19 globally, lose their lives to cancer;

Whereas childhood cancer is the leading cause of death from disease and the second overall leading cause of death for children in the United States;

Whereas the 5-year survival rate for children with cancer has increased from 58 percent in the mid-1970s to 84 percent in 2020,

representing significant improvement from previous decades;

Whereas 2/3 of children who survive cancer will develop at least 1 chronic health condition, and 1/4 of all survivors will face a late-effect from treatment that could be considered severe or life-threatening;

Whereas cancer patients face a higher risk of contracting the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) due to a weakened immune system; and

Whereas cancer occurs regularly and randomly and spares no racial or ethnic group, socioeconomic class, or geographic region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2020 as “National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month”;

(2) requests that the Federal Government, States, localities, and nonprofit organizations observe the month with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing public knowledge of the risks of cancer;

(3) encourages survivors of childhood cancer to continue to receive ongoing monitoring and physical and psychosocial care throughout their adult lives;

(4) recognizes the human toll of cancer and pledges to make the prevention and cure of cancer a public health priority; and

(5) reminds the people of the United States that these children are the definition of bravery, and commends and honors their courage.

SENATE RESOLUTION 743—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL RETIREMENT SECURITY MONTH, INCLUDING RAISING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE VARIOUS TAX-PREFERRED RETIREMENT VEHICLES, INCREASING PERSONAL FINANCIAL LITERACY, AND ENGAGING THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE KEYS TO SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING RETIREMENT SECURITY THROUGHOUT THEIR LIFETIMES

Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 743

Whereas people in the United States are living longer, and the cost of retirement is increasing significantly;

Whereas Social Security remains the bedrock of retirement income for the great majority of the people of the United States but was never intended by Congress to be the sole source of retirement income for families;

Whereas data from the Employee Benefit Research Institute indicates that, in the United States—

(1) up to 40 percent of households in which the head of household is between the ages of 35 and 64 are likely to run out of money in retirement; and

(2) the amount that workers have saved for retirement is much less than the amount those workers need to adequately fund their retirement years;

Whereas the financial literacy of workers in the United States is important so that those workers understand the need to save for retirement;

Whereas saving for retirement is a key component of overall financial health and se-

curity during retirement years, and the importance of financial literacy in planning for retirement must be advocated;

Whereas many workers may not—

(1) be aware of their various options in saving for retirement; or

(2) have focused on the importance of, and need for, saving for retirement and successfully achieving retirement security;

Whereas, although many employees have access to defined benefit and defined contribution plans through their employers to assist such employees in preparing for retirement, many of those employees may not be taking advantage of those plans at all or to the full extent allowed by Federal law;

Whereas saving for retirement is necessary even during economic downturns or market declines, underscoring the importance of continued contributions;

Whereas all workers, including public and private sector employees, employees of tax-exempt organizations, and self-employed individuals, can benefit from developing personal budgets and financial plans that include retirement savings strategies that take advantage of tax-preferred retirement savings vehicles;

Whereas effectively and sustainably withdrawing retirement resources throughout an individual’s retirement years is as important and crucial as saving and accumulating funds for retirement; and

Whereas the month of October 2020, has been designated as “National Retirement Security Month”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Month, including raising public awareness of the importance of saving adequately for retirement;

(2) acknowledges the need to raise public awareness of the variety of tax-preferred retirement vehicles that are used by many people in the United States, but remain underutilized; and

(3) calls on States, localities, schools, universities, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe National Retirement Security Month with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing the retirement savings and personal financial literacy of all people in the United States and enhancing the retirement security of the people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 744—CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ON THE CELEBRATION OF ITS 51ST CONVENTION ON OCTOBER 5, 2020, AND RECOGNIZING THE VITAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED STATES MADE BY THE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR 103 YEARS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 744

Whereas the National Federation of Federal Employees (referred to in this preamble as the “NFFE”) was created in 1917 as the first union in the United States to exclusively represent civil service Federal employees;

Whereas the NFFE preserves, promotes, and improves the rights and working conditions of Federal employees and other profes-

sionals through all lawful means, including collective bargaining, legislative activities, and contributing to civic and charitable organizations;

Whereas the contributions of the NFFE are noted in history through a century of achievements for the Federal labor movement, including numerous reforms to work-force policies and working conditions;

Whereas members of the NFFE serve the United States by performing critical functions throughout Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Federal Aviation Administration, the General Services Administration, the Indian Health Service, the Passport Service of the Bureau of Consular Affairs, and the Corps of Engineers;

Whereas, through a partnership with the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers and the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the NFFE promotes better working conditions and an improved quality of life for working families across the United States;

Whereas the NFFE represents more than 110,000 Federal employees; and

Whereas the NFFE continues to ensure that the voices of Federal civil servants are properly represented: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and honors the National Federation of Federal Employees on the celebration of its 51st Convention; and

(2) recognizes the vital contributions of the members of the National Federation of Federal Employees to the United States during the 103-year period since the founding of the National Federation of Federal Employees.

SENATE RESOLUTION 745—HONORING THE LIFE, LEGACY, AND EXAMPLE OF FORMER ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER YITZHAK RABIN ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS DEATH

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KAINÉ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 745

Whereas Yitzhak Rabin was born March 1, 1922, in Jerusalem;

Whereas Yitzhak Rabin served as Ambassador to the United States from 1968 to 1973, Minister of Defense from 1984 to 1990, and Prime Minister from 1974 to 1977 and from 1992 until his assassination in 1995;

Whereas, in 1975, Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin signed the interim agreement with Egypt which laid the groundwork for the 1979 Camp David Peace Treaty between Israel and Egypt;

Whereas, on September 13, 1993, in Washington, D.C., Yitzhak Rabin signed the Declaration of Principles framework agreement between Israel and the Palestinians, also known as the Oslo Accords;

Whereas Yitzhak Rabin, along with Shimon Peres and Yasser Arafat, received the 1994 Nobel Peace Prize for their efforts to create peace in the Middle East;

Whereas, in his acceptance speech for the Nobel Prize, Rabin said, “We will pursue the course of peace with determination and fortitude. We will not let up. We will not give in. Peace will triumph over all our enemies,

because the alternative is grim for us all. And we will prevail. We will prevail because we regard the building of peace as a great blessing for us, and for our children after us.”;

Whereas, on October 26, 1994, Yitzhak Rabin and King Hussein of Jordan signed a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan, saying at the time: “There is only one radical means of sanctifying human lives. Not armored plating, or tanks, or planes, or concrete fortifications. The one radical solution is peace.”;

Whereas, on November 4, 1995, Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated after attending a peace rally in Tel Aviv, where his last words were, “I have always believed that the majority of the people want peace, are prepared to take risks for peace . . . Peace is what the Jewish People aspire to.”;

Whereas Yitzhak Rabin dedicated his life to the cause of peace and security for the State of Israel by defending his nation against all threats, including terrorism and invasion, and undertaking courageous risks in the pursuit of peace;

Whereas, in the years following Yitzhak Rabin’s assassination, successive United States administrations have sought to help Israel and the Palestinians achieve a negotiated two-state solution that ends their conflict; and

Whereas, twenty-five years later, the leadership of Yitzhak Rabin can be a model for securing peace during a time of conflict: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the historic role of Yitzhak Rabin for his distinguished service to the Israeli people and extends its deepest sympathy and condolences to the family of Yitzhak Rabin and the people of Israel on the 25th anniversary of his death;

(2) recognizes and reiterates its continued support for the close ties and special relationship between the United States and Israel;

(3) expresses support and admiration for community leaders and government officials who work tirelessly to encourage co-existence and cooperation between the Israelis and Palestinians; and

(4) reaffirms its strong support for a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states—a democratic Jewish State of Israel, and a viable, democratic Palestinian state—living side-by-side in peace, security, and mutual recognition.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2678. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4653, to protect the healthcare of hundreds of millions of people of the United States and prevent efforts of the Department of Justice to advocate courts to strike down the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2679. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4653, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2678. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4653, to protect the healthcare of hundreds of millions of people of the United States and prevent efforts of the Department of Justice to advocate courts to strike down the Pa-

tient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION MODIFYING THE NUMBER OF JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report amending section 1 of title 28, United States Code, to modify, or that otherwise modifies, the total number of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

(2) POINT OF ORDER SUSTAINED.—If a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision described in paragraph (1), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a)(1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 2679. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4653, to protect the healthcare of hundreds of millions of people of the United States and prevent efforts of the Department of Justice to advocate courts to strike down the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 2. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION MODIFYING THE NUMBER OF JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report amending section 1 of title 28, United States Code, to modify, or that otherwise modifies, the total number of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

(2) POINT OF ORDER SUSTAINED.—If a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision described in paragraph (1), and the

point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a)(1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 3 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 1, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 1, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 1, 2020, at 9:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 742, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 742) designating September 2020 as National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 742) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL RETIREMENT SECURITY MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 743, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 743) supporting the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Month, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles, increasing personal financial literacy, and engaging the people of the United States on the keys to success in achieving and maintaining retirement security throughout their lifetimes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 743) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

FLOODS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 4462 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4462) to establish a national integrated flood information system within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Wicker substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 4462), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WHOLE VETERAN ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2359, which was received from the House.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2359) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Veterans Affairs advancing of whole health transformation.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2359) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

IDENTIFYING BARRIERS AND BEST PRACTICES STUDY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4183 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4183) to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a

study on disability and pension benefits provided to members of the National Guard and members of reserve components of the Armed Forces by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for Other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 4183) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 4433

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of S. 4433 and the bill be referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 4462

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we vitiate action on S. 4462.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4:30 p.m., Monday, October 5; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the Newman nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2020, AT 4:30 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:31 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 5, 2020, at 4:30 p.m.