



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2020

No. 178—Part II

## Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, October 19, 2020)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, 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.

Great God and Father, Your anger lasts only for a moment, but Your favor lasts a lifetime. Lord, open our eyes to see the wonders of Your grace and the majesty of Your love for people everywhere. Keep our lawmakers from being blind to the work You are doing in our world. Bring healing to the sick and liberation to the oppressed.

Lord, You have watched over this land we love from generation to generation, in prosperity and adversity, in peace and war. Today, keep our Senators so dedicated that they will do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with You.

We pray in Your Holy 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.

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Michael Jay Newman, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Iowa.

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

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

### TRIBUTE TO DAN GABLE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, fellow Iowan Dan Gable is one of the greatest athletes and coaches in American history. President Trump has selected Dan to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom—the highest civilian honor. I sent a letter to the White House after hearing about grassroots support in Iowa for this award.

Dan Gable is a household name for every Iowa sports fan. As a wrestler at Iowa State University, Dan won two collegiate championships—a world championship and an Olympic Gold Medal. His overall high school and college records are 181 victories, 1 defeat. That one defeat came in the finals of the NCAA tournament of his senior year. In his coaching career at the University of Iowa, he led to 15 national team championships out of the 21 years that he coached.

As a coach at the University of Iowa, Dan developed All Americans, national champions, Big Ten champions, and Olympians. Dan is the paragon of the American dream in his achieving success through community, courage, hard work, and determination.

I congratulate Dan on this outstanding achievement.

I yield the floor.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, “It would have been really hard for us to get through without it.” That was the coowner of Apollo Pizza, which has a handful of locations throughout Kentucky.

“It touches my heart just knowing that I can bring folks back and gainfully employ people who need to work.” That was a restaurateur in Fayetteville, NC.

“It’s pennies from heaven as far as our business is concerned.” That was

one small business owner in Highlands Ranch, CO.

“It just made sense to us that if we’re going to be able to get money from the government . . . spend it on our employees.” That is from a fourth-generation owner of a bagel shop in Ferndale, MI.

Those are just four of the millions and millions of hard-working Americans who have had an economic lifeline to help them endure this crisis year. That lifeline is the Paycheck Protection Program, the PPP.

About 7 months ago, our Nation’s top medical experts recommended we do something without precedent—shutter whole sectors of the economy to protect Americans from the pandemic. Congress needed a historic plan to help workers, and our colleagues Senator Rubio and Senator Collins stepped forward. They realized we could not simply let Main Street go under. We could not simply tell millions and millions more workers to forget about their jobs and join the unemployment lines. We couldn’t just let every storefront except the biggest corporate retailers turn into permanent pandemic ghost towns. We had to give small businesses and their workers a fighting chance.

The senior Senators from Maine and Florida found the solution. They literally invented the PPP. It would fund emergency loans to employers, and those loans would be forgivable so long as the money would be used to keep paying their people. As far as emergency government rescues go, their idea was actually a bold, free-enterprise policy. Don’t just sign everyone up for welfare; fight to save jobs. Keep workers connected to their jobs and their paychecks.

As we wrote the CARES Act, Senators Rubio and Collins got together with Senator CARDIN and put the finishing touches on the program. Soon, the PPP had become law without a single dissenting vote in either Chamber.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S6303

The program proved so popular that it quickly committed all its funding. So, in April, we refilled it with more money. That was unanimous in the Senate as well. Then, in June, we tweaked the program on the fly to help small businesses even more. Once again, it was unanimous—no objection from any Republican or any Democrat here in the Senate. This program has had the most bipartisan pedigree possible, and those bipartisan beginnings have led to a major policy success story.

For millions of Americans from coast to coast, the PPP has made all the difference in the world. It has kept paychecks coming into their mailboxes and bank accounts where there otherwise would have been pink slips. Every State, every town, every city knows the difference it has made.

So where are we today?

That historic first draw of the PPP has wound down; the program has closed to new applications; many firms have run through their funds, but, clearly, our economic recovery remains a work in progress. For many workers, business has not come roaring back to normal, and it won't until the health situation allows it.

Fortunately, Senator RUBIO and Senator COLLINS have stepped up again. Our colleagues have legislation that will refund and reopen the PPP. It will establish a whole second round for the hardest hit small businesses that need help the most, and thanks to the efforts of several colleagues, the legislation will also streamline the program and strengthen oversight.

I would submit that, even for a Congress this divided, even in the year 2020, reopening the PPP really ought to be a no-brainer. There is bipartisan agreement that American workers still need help, and there is already bipartisan infrastructure in place to provide that help, but there is a problem. The PPP has been taken hostage. Just like the funding for safe schools, more funding for testing, more funding for vaccines, more funding for Federal unemployment benefits, and commonsense legal protections that charities and university presidents have been pleading for, the PPP has been taken hostage by Speaker PELOSI and Leader SCHUMER.

The Democratic leaders have spent months holding out for a long, far-left wish list of non-COVID-related priorities and obstructing any additional aid until they get it. All or nothing—that has been their position. Either Democrats get every unrelated policy they want or American families get nothing. So, for months, they have blocked bipartisan aid at every single turn. The Democratic leader even tried last night to adjourn the Senate so we could do nothing at all for 3 weeks—nothing at all for 3 weeks. That is how urgent he thinks it is to help working people. He wanted to go home for 3 weeks.

Because President Trump will not just cave to the entire Democratic Par-

ty's platform—for example, the President won't simply hand out endless sums of cash to chronically mismanaged State and city governments out of proportion to COVID needs—Speaker PELOSI has seen to it that working families have gotten nothing rather than something.

So, look, every Senator in this body knows this is not how people act if they actually want an outcome. American families, working families, have waited months and months for Speaker PELOSI to end her “Marie Antoinette” act and let Congress find common ground. There is no reason this second round of the Paycheck Protection Program should wait another single day. So we are going to vote on this legislation today—one clear vote on one clear program that all in this Chamber say they want to pass.

Well, I will let you in on a secret. There is something Senators do when we want something to pass. Here is what we do when we want something to pass: We vote for it. It is no counter-argument to complain that the PPP legislation does not also contain 100 other things. The entire point is to agree where we can and make law while we keep arguing over all the rest.

If my Democratic colleagues oppose the job-saving PPP, they should come to the floor and say why they oppose it. Otherwise, this afternoon should bring another unanimous vote.

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. SCHUMER. Mr. 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 MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, COVID-19 has changed just about every aspect of American life—every aspect. The bottom line is very simple: The way Americans work, the way we send our kids to school, and the way we run our businesses have all changed. COVID has derailed the economy.

Millions of Americans have missed the rent, missed the mortgage, applied for unemployment, been forced to skip meals. American poverty is beginning to increase more dramatically. More than 8 million have gotten sick. More than 220,000 have died.

The response here in Congress to a pandemic that affects our country in a way we haven't seen in decades should be to comprehensively provide relief. Our mission is not to pick out one or two industries and say “maybe later” to the rest. We can't privilege a small issue here or there and ask everyone else to wait. Our mission is to deliver big for a country and a people who are suffering direly. Our mission is to meet the needs of the country and leave no one—and leave no one—behind.

But Leader MCCONNELL and the Republican majority have failed to grasp the gravity of this situation from the beginning. They put the Senate on pause for more than 5 months, while cases went up and the death toll mounted. When the time came for them to pull together in August, they couldn't even get Republican Senators to agree on one. Eight months into this long and brutal crisis, the Republican leader is filled with stunts and playing the smallest of small ball, when so many are hurting.

Today, the Republican majority will try to force a stunt—not even a real vote on a bill—but it leaves almost the entire country out of the picture. They are holding the vote over a backdrop of a dire increase in cases. The majority of States are seeing spikes right now. Half of all States have had their highest single day ever in total cases in the last month.

Experts say we have hard months ahead of us. It is possible the worst is yet to come—a second wave. We must act now to provide relief to the whole country, and our Republican leader and the Republican Senate are up to a stunt and not even negotiating or putting a bill on the floor, and the American people know it. They know who is to blame. They blame President Trump and the Republican majority. We know that.

We know, when it comes to COVID, that the blame correctly falls on the shoulders of Leader MCCONNELL and all his Republican Senators, who are afraid to do anything, who are divided. Anytime Mr. Mnuchin gets on the phone with them, they say: Don't do anything. We are too divided.

Everyone knows that.

We must provide real relief. That is what Democrats want to do. But in the Republican proposal today, there is no funding—zero funding—for testing or tracing, the best way to stop this COVID menace.

And in the Republican bill tomorrow, the funding for testing and the plan for testing is so completely inadequate that it is laughable, especially given the recent spike in cases.

In the Republican proposal today, there is nothing for American families, schools, daycare, or food assistance. They are left behind—all of them. Renters, homeowners, folks struggling to keep a roof over their heads—they are left behind. Americans who have lost their job through no fault of their own and need unemployment insurance—they are left behind in these Republican proposals.

State and local governments that are being forced to slash critical public service in the middle of a recession—they, too, are all left behind.

Even on the issue of small business, the issue on which this bill is focused, it lacks specific funding for restaurants, for independent theaters and venues, for local newspapers, TV, radio stations, critical-need hospitals, minority-owned businesses, and all of our

nonprofits. In each of those areas in which the Republican bill is deficient, so many are left behind.

We have bipartisan support for programs that are not even being considered here today. And why is that? Why is McCONNELL doing stunts? The truth is, because the leader can't pass anything on the floor, he is resorting to a series of political stunts. That is all. Everyone knows it.

The Republican leader himself admitted that as many as 20 Republican Senators don't want to vote for "a dime more"—"a dime more," his quote—of relief for the American people—so out of touch, so callous, so cruel.

So what we have here is a series of show stunt votes designed to fail because the Republicans want them to fail. It is not going to get the job done for the American people. They can't even put a real bill on the floor. The only bills that they can pass are filled with poison pills that they know no Democrat will support in the House or Senate.

That was the only way they could get them to vote even for this meager amount in tomorrow's bill—by telling the big corporations: No liability for you if you egregiously hurt a worker who has COVID; by telling wealthy parents: You can pay for private school education with a complete tax break—free, free, but public schools get left out, middle class people get left out, poor people get left out. Wealthy people who send their kids to private schools—that is it—while they refuse to give money to the public schools that need the money.

If Leader McCONNELL were serious, you know what he would be doing. He would be negotiating. He wouldn't be saying: I can't negotiate; my caucus is divided. He would be leading instead of following the 20 hard-right, cruel, callous thoughts of those who don't want to spend any money because their wealthy paymasters don't want to pay taxes. Let people suffer. I don't want to pay taxes. Let people suffer. I don't want government to do anything—when we all know the only real hope here is for a strong, active, and bold government-led program. The private sector can't fight COVID alone. The private sector can't get us out of this deep recession alone. We know that, but not the hard-right Republicans. They are stuck in their narrow ideological prison.

So instead of stunts, Senators will actually have a chance today to vote on a real comprehensive bill to address the current state of the country. For months, Democrats have been pushing for the Heroes Act, a second installment of the kind of comprehensive COVID relief we passed in the first bill that brought so much to people, helped them stay in their homes, brought pandemic unemployment insurance, helped our hospitals, helped our local governments, helped do some testing—testing money, by the way, and tracing money, which the Trump administration hasn't even distributed to the States.

This bill passed the House over 3 months ago, and since then, Democrats have modified the bill to move closer to our Republican counterparts. Still, Leader McCONNELL refuses to even bring it up for a vote in the Senate. So today Democrats will move to have the Senate take a vote on the Heroes Act, a comprehensive bill that does so much, that doesn't leave all the people behind that this proposal does. We will see where every Republican Senator stands on real COVID relief—not a stunt, a fake that leaves people out.

Unlike the partisan, emaciated Republican COVID relief bill, the Heroes Act will not leave large portions of the country behind. It will not include poison pills like sweeping corporate immunity provisions that Leader McCONNELL has insisted on in every version of Republican legislation. It will deliver actual relief to American workers, American families, American States and localities and Tribes. It provides assistance for food, rent, and housing; real funding for testing and tracing; unemployment insurance and aid to small businesses of all kinds, not just a few.

This morning, a poll conducted by the New York Times and Siena Research showed that 72 percent of Americans, including a clear majority of Independents and Republicans, support another \$2 trillion stimulus package. In other words, 72 percent support the Democratic plan to provide COVID relief. Even President Trump has told our Republican Senate colleagues to "go big or go home."

If my Republican colleagues were listening to the American people, they would not be playing these partisan games around small-bore, stunt-driven COVID bills. They would be working with Democrats on something that absolutely meets people's needs. Instead, the Republican leader is wasting the American people's time on a vote he knows will fail, and he doesn't even seem to mind.

#### NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. President, on SCOTUS, yesterday, on a 4-to-4 split ruling, the Supreme Court declined to hear a case that could have prevented the State of Pennsylvania from counting all the votes in the November election. It was an important decision for democracy but also a reminder of what is truly at stake in a Supreme Court vacancy left by Justice Ginsburg. One more vote provided by a hard-right, Trump-nominated Justice could be the difference between voting rights and voting suppression.

Over the past several years, closely divided decisions of the Supreme Court have meant the difference between having the ability to marry the person you love or not; the ability to have your right to vote protected or not; the ability to make personal choices about your own healthcare or not.

The American people should know exactly what is at stake in the nomination of Judge Barrett to the Supreme

Court—nothing less than their fundamental rights as Americans. So, frankly, it was an insult to the intelligence of the American people for Judge Barrett to spend the entire Judiciary Committee hearing dodging every single question of substance, including questions as to whether voter intimidation is illegal or whether the President could unilaterally delay the election—to not be able to answer whether the President could unilaterally delay the election? Whoa.

Just think about what it means for a sitting judge to refuse to answer a question about voter intimidation—voting, the wellspring of our democracy—because she thinks it is too controversial. Think about what it means for a sitting judge to refuse to answer a question about the peaceful transfer of power—the bedrock of our democracy—because it might upset her patron, President Trump. It is absurd. No one is buying it.

Every election season, Republicans promise to nominate judges who will tear down our healthcare and roll back the clock on women's rights. The far right promises to deliver judges who will dismantle the environmental regulations that keep our air and water clean and protect our planet from runaway global warming. President Trump has made the same promises out loud many times. But as soon as someone is nominated to be a Justice, all of a sudden that person becomes a legal vacuum, a cipher, totally devoid of ideas, views, or opinions, even on the questions of basic legal, uncontroversial fact.

The truth is, Judge Barrett does have, unfortunately, hard-right views and opinions on these issues. Her views are so far away from the American people that none of them could pass in this Senate—even though it is controlled by Republicans—and certainly not in the House.

She has harshly criticized decisions to uphold the Affordable Care Act. She has been closely affiliated with organizations that advocate for the elimination of a woman's right to choose. She has drafted judicial opinions on the issue of gun safety that put her far to the right of even Justice Scalia.

That is why, in the hearings last week, the president for the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law said: "Judge Barrett's views are far outside the mainstream." That is why yesterday the plaintiffs in the decisions that resulted in marriage equality—Obergefell and Hodges—said they oppose Judge Barrett for the Supreme Court because she will endanger those hard-won rights.

So the idea that Judge Barrett is some sort of neutral arbiter who will only interpret the law as it is written is just not believable. She will make hugely impactful decisions that will alter the fabric of American society, starting with what will be one of her very first cases—a lawsuit pushed by President Trump and Republicans to

rip away healthcare from millions of Americans.

God save us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. "Idiots." "Idiots." That is what the President called Dr. Anthony Fauci and the public health experts in the Federal Government.

The President said:

People are tired of COVID. I have the biggest rallies I've ever had. And we have COVID. People are saying: "Whatever. Just leave us alone." They're tired of it.

Then he added:

People are tired of hearing Fauci and these idiots, all these idiots who got it wrong.

Those are the words of the President of the United States, Donald Trump, in the midst of the worst pandemic America has seen in over a century—220,000 dead and counting.

What lies ahead with this COVID epidemic, which the President is so tired of hearing about? What have the so-called "idiots" told us about the future of COVID-19? Here is what they have told us: More than 70,450 new coronavirus cases were reported in the United States on Friday, the highest figure since July 24, according to the New York Times database. More than 900 new deaths were recorded, and over the past week, there have been an average of 56,615 cases per day—an increase of 30 percent from the average 2 weeks earlier.

Is this a political commentary, these facts? No. These are the numbers and statistics of reality—a reality which President Trump refuses to acknowledge.

How are we doing when it comes to the COVID-19 pandemic compared to the world? Well, we have five times the infection rate of the nation of Germany. What is going on here? The great United States of America has five times the infection rate of Germany?

Well, let's get across the ocean. Let's bring it to this side of the Atlantic. How are we doing in comparison to the nations here? Well, let's compare the United States to Canada. The COVID death rate in the United States is 2½ times the death rate in Canada.

What does Justin Trudeau know about this epidemic that Donald Trump did not? He knew that it took leadership to deal with it. He knew that we had to step up as a nation and gather together all the people of this country in common purpose to beat back this virus, and he failed to do it—President Trump failed to do that. He said to the Governors "You are on your own. Go out and find protective equipment. Find ventilators. See what you can do on the open market" instead of using the power of the Presidency and the leadership of the Presidency to help make certain that every American had access to what they needed to stay safe.

How did he do in setting standards for dealing with this deadly virus?

First, he denied it was deadly. He argued it was going to go away. When it gets warm outside, it will go away. It is a hoax. You remember those statements. And do you remember that incredible press conference where the President went off on some tangent about disinfectant and Lysol? It was sickening to think that the leader of the free world would do that.

How about the example set by the President. To this day, to get this President to wear a mask is a rare occurrence. And there he was, just days after being helicoptered out to Walter Reed Hospital, returning to the White House, making his triumphant balcony scene, standing before the American people and ripping off his mask just to tell them how tough he was, how lucky he was. He was really telling the American people: Don't take this mask business seriously. He can say the words, but he just mouths them. The fact that you can see his mouth is an indication that he doesn't believe it. And here we are.

Fortunately, in the early stages of this pandemic, this Congress rose to the occasion. It was March 26. We called it the CARES Act. It was indeed a comprehensive effort to deal with the coronavirus, a comprehensive approach. We imagined all the possibilities, we saw the economy sinking under our feet, and we came together with a vote of 96 to nothing here in the U.S. Senate—a bipartisan vote of 96 to nothing—for a bill that we wrote together, Democrats and Republicans sitting together.

It was an amazing day, and I am glad we did it, but there was one clear shortcoming. We assumed when we passed the CARES Act that, come the end of July and first part of August, this crisis would be behind us. It isn't. At the end of July, for example, the Federal supplement of unemployment insurance ran out for millions of Americans. In the first part of August, the loans to small businesses dried up as well.

What has happened since? Well, on the other side of the Rotunda, in the House of Representatives, Speaker NANCY PELOSI, 5 months ago—5 months ago—passed her Heroes Act. It was \$3 trillion—comparable to the first effort. She sent it to the Republican leader of the Senate, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky, for him to do his part. It is a bicameral legislature. His part would require coming up with an alternative and taking that to conference.

Did he do that? No. He refused to acknowledge it and mocked day after day after day the efforts of Speaker PELOSI, questioning whether they were enough or sincere or too political, on and on and on. Did he pass his own measure? No.

Then negotiations started between the President, his White House representatives, Speaker PELOSI, and Leader SCHUMER. They invited Senator MCCONNELL, head of the Republicans in the Senate, and KEVIN MCCARTHY, head

of the Republicans in the House, to join in this bipartisan negotiation. MCCONNELL and MCCARTHY declined. They would not even sit in the chairs during negotiations. In Senator MCCONNELL's case, he simply came to the floor on a daily basis to mock every effort to respond to this COVID-19.

Well, this is not a news bulletin, but we are 2 weeks away from the election, and guess what we are going to do on the floor of the Senate today. We are going to entertain a new idea by Senator MCCONNELL of how to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic. It turns out that it is a scant list of his priorities. Not surprisingly, the first priority is an issue he has called his redline on the floor over and over again—to give immunity from liability to businesses that fail to take the necessary steps to protect their employees and their customers from the spread of this deadly virus. That is his first priority. He has said that. Even before the first issue was raised as to what would be included in this, the first thing that Senator MCCONNELL insisted on was protecting these businesses.

How do the American people feel about that? Well, they are pretty clear. They believe if you put that immunity in place, that many businesses won't do what they need to do to protect their employees and customers. They worry that this gets them off the hook instead of putting the responsibility clearly on their shoulders.

The good news is the overwhelming majority of businesses that I know are really trying to do the right thing. The bad news is they are not sure what that is. They hear about CDC guidelines that are ignored and mocked by the President, and they hear about the possibility of other standards that will be used.

We have had hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee when a Texas businessman with a string of convenience stores, I think, came to us and in good faith said: I don't know where to turn for a standard of care. What am I supposed to do if I want to protect everyone coming into my store—employees and customers alike?

I thought his statement was genuine. I really believed him, and I still do. But it is no excuse for what we have failed to do here. We have failed to come up with a national standard to protect people from the spread of this virus.

Instead, Senator MCCONNELL comes to the floor and says: If you can find any standard by any level of government, it is good enough. You are off the hook. That is no way to lead in the midst of a deadly pandemic.

It is not the only issue. There are many others. Take a look at what is missing in Senator MCCONNELL's proposal. There is no new funding when it comes to State and local governments. Remember the phrase "defund the police"? You heard it from the rightwing about the leftwing of American politics wanting to defund the police. Well, Senator MCCONNELL's action will

defund police at State and local levels because these units of government won't have the resources to hire the policemen they need, the law enforcement officials they need, nor the firefighters, nor the teachers, nor the healthcare workers. But that is priority one for Senator McCONNELL: no help—no help for State and local governments for fear that you might actually send money to a Democratic mayor or a Democratic Governor. Spare me. That fire is not looking for party registration; it is looking for kindling to light the fire of infection.

Now, on housing, well, how does the McConnell proposal deal with housing? No funding—no funding for housing or rental assistance.

Now, on the stimulus checks—\$1,200 stimulus checks. I listened to talk radio back in Chicago, and people are wondering: Is it possible we are going to see a \$1,200 check? Well, you won't see it in Senator McCONNELL's proposal. There are no direct stimulus payments.

How about unemployment benefits? The Federal unemployment benefits that expired on July 31 were \$600 a week over the State amount, whatever it might be. Some people may have made more in the process than they did at work, but most were struggling to get by. If Members of the Senate had not been in touch with real America in a while, they may think that folks with these checks were binging on Netflix and eating chocolate-covered cherries night and day. That is not the case that I saw back in Illinois. People who had lost their jobs, even at the time they received these unemployment checks, were still struggling to pay for the mortgage, pay for the rent, pay for the car, keep up with the credit card bills, and put food on the table.

So what does Senator McCONNELL propose that we do? He proposes we cut in half that amount—to \$300 a week. I guess back in Kentucky it is a little bit different world, at least the way he sees it, but where I live, that means a pretty dramatic cut in survival pay—survival pay—for people who have lost their jobs.

On the healthcare side, this is the one that troubles me the most. Couldn't we all agree that we don't test enough for the COVID-19 virus in America? There are about 1 million people tested a day. Public health officials say: Well, you need at least 4 million. Others say: But if you truly want to reopen the economy and reopen the schools, you need 14 million a day. So you would guess that anything we pass would really zero in on testing to find out those who are positive, to do the contact tracing to warn those who may have been exposed, and to try to contain the virus.

So let's take a look at what Senator McCONNELL thinks about the priority of testing. There is \$16 billion for testing. How much did the Democrats—NANCY PELOSI—propose? She proposed \$75 billion. And let me add that the

McConnell bill provides no funding for hospitals or healthcare clinics and no dedicated funding for nursing homes, where we know the populations are so vulnerable. When it comes to the reality of what we are facing in this COVID-19 pandemic, the McConnell bill, which is coming before us this afternoon, is deficient in testing at a time when we are facing so many infections.

On nutrition, the McConnell bill says that there will be no SNAP benefit increases or funding for food banks and, on education, provides \$105 billion for education stabilization funds. Two-thirds of the K-12 funds will be held until schools provide a reopening plan and, of course, the voucher program.

On postal assistance, the McConnell proposal alters the language in the original legislation to change the borrowing authority. The Postal Service is doing its best, and I thank the men and women who are engaged in it. We should do more than thank them. We ought to fund them and give them a helping hand.

So what it boils down to is this: If this is a real pandemic, if we want to believe the public health experts—whom the President has called “idiots,” like Dr. Anthony Fauci, who has been my friend for 20 years—if we want to believe the public health experts, we need to address this in a serious manner as we did last March in passing the CARES Act. This is not a time for people to cover their backsides politically. It is a time to remember that the American people need our help more than ever. A halfhearted and half-inspired effort to do this will not answer the call.

We need to stand as a nation on a bipartisan basis. How does it start? It starts when Democrats and Republicans sit at the same table, which has not happened. It starts when we agree—both parties agree—on what the priorities must be, and it starts when we stop the speeches and start with real action to pass legislation like the CARES Act, which passed 96 to nothing on this floor. It is time to take this deadly virus and epidemic seriously.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### RECESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:07 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

#### NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last week, the Judiciary Committee held

its hearing on Judge Amy Coney Barrett's nomination, and it was easy to see why Judge Barrett is held in such high regard by her colleagues, students, and peers and why the American Bar Association gave her its highest rating of “well qualified.”

We knew long before the hearing that Judge Barrett possesses an extraordinary intelligence and a comprehensive command of the law. But over 3 days of testimony, Americans got to see her qualifications for themselves, and they saw why she has been described as “a jurist of formidable intellect,” a “brilliant and conscientious lawyer,” and “a staggering academic mind.” Even the Democratic ranking member on the committee, the senior Senator from California, couldn't hide the fact that she was impressed.

Most importantly, however, Americans saw that Judge Barrett understands the proper role of a judge in our system of government. As Judge Barrett made clear, she understands that the job of a judge is to interpret the law, not to make the law; to call balls and strikes, not to rewrite the rules of the game; or, as Judge Barrett said to the Democrat whip at the hearing last week: “I apply the law. I follow the law. You make policy.”

Judge Barrett has made it clear that when cases come before her on the Supreme Court, she will consider the facts, the law, and the Constitution, and nothing else—not her personal beliefs, not her political opinions, just the law and the Constitution. That is the kind of Justice that all of us—Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative—should want.

I could spend hours highlighting all the extraordinary tributes to Judge Barrett that have poured in since her nomination, from lawyers and scholars of every background and political persuasion, but I don't want to tie up the Senate floor. So I will just mention one piece of testimony that struck me in particular.

As I mentioned, the American Bar Association released its rating of Judge Barrett last week, a rating that the Democratic leader, by the way, has called the “gold standard”—the “gold standard”—by which judicial candidates are judged. Well, the ABA gave Judge Barrett its highest possible rating—“well qualified.” And the chairman of the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, the ABA committee that issues these ratings, testified before the Judiciary Committee during Judge Barrett's hearing. I would like to read from the testimony that he submitted to the committee.

Lawyers and judges uniformly praised the nominee's integrity. Most remarkably, in interviews with individuals in the legal profession and the community who know Judge Barrett, whether for a few years or decades, not one person uttered a negative word about her character. Accordingly, the Standing Committee was not required to consider any negative criticisms of Judge Barrett.

His testimony went on:

All of the experienced, dedicated, and knowledgeable sitting judges, legal scholars, and lawyers who have worked with or against Judge Barrett had high praise for her intellect and ability to communicate clearly and effectively. . . . Given the breadth, diversity, and strength of the positive feedback we received from judges and lawyers of all political persuasions and from so many parts of the profession, the Standing Committee would have been hard-pressed to come to any conclusion other than that Judge Barrett has demonstrated professional competence that is exceptional.

We are fortunate to have a nominee like Judge Barrett, and I look forward to confirming her to the Supreme Court in the very near future.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, in addition to considering Judge Barrett's nomination this week, the Senate will once again be taking up coronavirus relief legislation.

We tried this in September, of course, but Senate Democrats filibustered our relief bill. But we are going to try again because we believe there are priorities that need to be met—priorities that everyone should be able to agree on. They are things like helping the hardest hit small businesses, getting schools the resources they need to safely reopen and safely operate, and providing additional healthcare resources to fight the virus.

Democrats, of course, have spent a lot of time talking about how we need to pass additional coronavirus relief, but despite being given every opportunity to come forward with a realistic compromise bill, they have continued to insist on bloated legislation that would not only spend taxpayer dollars on noncoronavirus-related measures but would not have a chance of becoming law.

It is very difficult for me to understand Democrats' thinking—that is, if they really want to get more COVID relief to Americans and don't just want to use this as a political issue.

I realize that Democrats would like to pass exactly the bill they want, but their liberal wish list simply wouldn't make it through Congress. Democrats could, however, get something through Congress.

Republicans have made it clear from the beginning that we are willing to compromise with Democrats if they will just come to the table with a reasonable offer, but Democrats have so far decided that they would rather see Americans get no relief—zero relief—than compromise with Republicans. That is really difficult to understand, unless, as I said, Democrats aren't really interested in getting more COVID relief to Americans.

The Democrats' position makes a lot more sense if they are just trying to exploit this crisis for political gain.

But Republicans are going to try again this week. The bill that we are bringing up would address some of the Nation's most important coronavirus priorities—priorities, I would add, that are bipartisan priorities. I hope that

some Democrats will join us to get additional relief to the American people.

The Democrat leadership may be holding coronavirus relief hostage, but rank-and-file Democrats don't have to. They don't have to have their all-or-nothing wish list. They can come to a reasonable compromise and give much needed resources to the American people. Instead, what they are saying is zero relief—no relief—is better than compromising with Republicans. Unfortunately, that is an unfortunate position for them to be in and a very unfortunate position for the American people.

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

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

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise this afternoon in support of the amendment that Senator RUBIO and I have introduced to extend and strengthen the Paycheck Protection Program. It would allow our Nation's hardest hit small businesses to get a second forgivable PPP loan that they so desperately need. Our amendment would make available \$258 billion for new PPP forgivable loans.

Madam President, as I know you are aware from your experience in West Virginia, the Paycheck Protection Program has been hugely successful. In the State of Maine, three out of four of our small businesses have received forgivable loans totaling \$2.9 billion. To put that in context, that is equal to approximately half of the entire State budget. Most important of all, those loans have helped to sustain the jobs of more than 250,000 Mainers.

Nationwide, the PPP has been a critical lifeline for more than 5 million small employers, helping to sustain upward of 50 million American jobs.

As the Washington Post wrote in June following a dramatically better than expected jobs report: "Give some credit to the government relief efforts, especially the Paycheck Protection Program, for bringing back jobs."

This program has provided one-time loans sufficient to support 8 weeks of payroll plus a limited amount to help cover certain overhead expenses, which were completely forgivable as long as borrowers retained and paid their employees. Our purpose was to help small businesses save jobs and pay their workers, keeping that all-important employer-employee relationship intact so that, when businesses could reopen and Americans could go back to work, it could happen quickly when the pandemic subsided.

When Chairman RUBIO and I, together with Senators BEN CARDIN and JEANNE SHAHEEN, put the PPP together at the onset of the national emergency,

none of us could have envisioned that the pandemic would be so persistent, that here in October it would still be forcing shutdowns and mitigation measures that many months later.

Yet, the cruel fact is that the virus is still spreading, and many of the steps taken to fight it, while necessary to protect public health, threaten catastrophic damage to many small businesses and their employees who have been sustained by the PPP loan funds, but they are still unable to return to normal operations.

According to the NFIB, our Nation's largest advocacy group for small business, 84 percent of its small business members exhausted their PPP loan funds by mid-August. Many fear that they will have to lay off their employees—the last thing they want to do—or even cease operations altogether if more support is not forthcoming soon.

In a key letter in support of our amendment circulated today, the NFIB also said that its most recent survey shows that 49 percent of its members anticipate needing some sort of additional financial support in the next 12 months.

Let me give you an example. I recently learned of a T-shirt printing shop in Maine that received a PPP loan. It provided a lifeline to get this business through the past several months, but with many youth sports leagues and school activities still suspended, this business and its employees need more help to sustain them until springtime, when they hope to once again be printing T-shirts for little league teams and other sporting events.

The impact of the pandemic has been critically acute for our hotels, our restaurants, our B&Bs, and our seasonal businesses that rely on a strong summer to pay their bills throughout the year. A State like mine, which is so dependent on tourism, has been particularly hard-hit since many of our tourism-based businesses lost the first part of the summer.

A recent survey by the American Hotel and Lodging Association showed that, if we do not act and act soon to provide additional assistance, 74 percent of our Nation's hotels will be forced to lay off more workers, and two-thirds could even be forced to close their doors entirely.

The same is true in my State of Maine. An article published last month in the Bangor Daily News reports that the State could stand to lose two-thirds of hotels and direct lodging jobs if Congress doesn't approve more aid soon.

Our restaurants are also struggling. While tourists finally started to return to Maine in August, this summer season has understandably been one of the slowest on record for my State. With the warm weather gone and outdoor dining no longer feasible, many of our restaurants can accommodate only about half as many customers as they used to be able to accommodate and



still comply with the CDC guidelines. They fear that they may not be able to make it through the winter without further help.

A few days ago, I received an email from a couple who owns an award-winning restaurant in Portland, ME. This couple told me that they would have closed without the PPP loan but that they haven't taken a paycheck since March and simply cannot make it through the winter without a second round.

They put it as follows:

[We] love that PPP enabled us to keep in contact with our staff, even when they were not able to work in the beginning [due to the State restrictions]. Furthermore, it helped us to be able to hire them back so that we could reopen immediately. [But] at this point, we are staying open only to support our employees. The new PPP would give us the needed funds to limp through winter, while still keeping our staff employed and our customers safe.

I am sure that many other Members of the Senate are seeing the same in their States, and that is why it is so important that we renew once again this very successful program.

As you know, we went through the first \$359 billion in just 13 days. That is what the demand was like. Then we passed additional legislation to replenish the program with \$320 billion, but we only extended the date to August 8 for applicants for the program. We need to reopen it up to those who didn't apply the first time and now find themselves in need and to allow the hardest hit businesses to receive a second PPP loan.

We also need to do this to help our nonprofits that are also struggling to survive, and that is why we simply must put aside any partisan politics. This program was the product of bipartisan negotiations that went on day after day, night after night, and we came together.

Let me describe the key points in this proposal. First, the amendment would allow those small employers that have seen their revenues decline by 35 percent or more in the first, second, or third quarter of this year compared to the same quarter last year to receive an additional Paycheck Protection Program loan.

Second, because we want to target this additional assistance to the businesses that need it most, we generally limit eligibility to entities that have 300 or fewer employees, rather than 500.

Third, we expand the list of forgivable PPP expenses in some very commonsense ways. We allow forgiveness for the supplier costs and investments in facility modifications and personal protective equipment for the business to operate safely for its employees and its customers. Examples would be those plexiglass guards—the shields we are seeing everywhere—masks for employees, of course, and patio insulations and related outdoor furnishings. This is especially important to restaurants facing dining restrictions and those struggling to get the high-quality

food supply needed to operate because they have fallen behind in their bills.

Fourth, we extend PPP to small 501(c)(6) organizations that are not lobbying organizations and that have 150 or fewer employees, such as local chambers of commerce, economic development organizations, and tourism offices. They are doing a great job representing their members through this crisis.

Fifth, we would allow forgivable loan funds to be spent through December 31 and clarify that borrowers can apply for loan forgiveness at the time of their choosing after 8 weeks from the loan origination.

Sixth, we greatly simplify the loan forgiveness process for smaller borrowers. Those who make a good-faith effort to comply with the program's requirements would be able to use a one-page, simplified loan forgiveness form if they borrowed no more than \$150,000. We also make the loan forgiveness process less complex for borrowers of loans between \$150,000 and \$2 million.

Seventh, we provide the SBA with \$50 million in additional audit funding to ensure that it has the resources necessary to protect the program against fraud. Regrettably, there are always going to be those who attempt to exploit a program, and that is why we want to beef up the audit capacity.

Finally, our amendment includes a series of set-asides to ensure that smaller borrowers and underserved communities get the help they need. These set-asides include money for borrowers with 10 or fewer employees; \$10 billion for community financial institutions, such as small community banks and credit unions; and \$10 million for the Minority Business Development Agency. In addition, the amendment directs the SBA to issue guidance addressing barriers to accessing capital for minority, underserved, veteran, and women-owned businesses.

The Paycheck Protection Program is the result of a bipartisan commitment to support our small businesses, our nonprofits, and their employees during this pandemic. It has been a tremendous success, but many small businesses and nonprofits simply require more help now in order to survive, given the length and persistence of this pandemic.

This amendment provides that help. It is supported by the National Federation of Independent Business, the National Restaurant Association, the American Hotel and Lodging Association, the International Franchise Association, and HospitalityMaine.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letters of support for our amendment at the conclusion of my remarks.

Madam President, I urge our colleagues to support this amendment, to do so now, even if you disagree on other issues that may be taken up. Surely, we can come together and extend this bipartisan, highly successful

program to secure the jobs of small businesses and also to ensure that these small businesses stay afloat. We want to make sure that small businesses, which employed the majority of people in this country, are able to keep their employees employed.

We can continue to work to find common ground—and I am involved in those efforts—on other policies to help support the health and safety of Americans and the safe, responsible opening of our communities. We need more resources for tests and vaccine development; for aid to municipalities and schools; for assistance to our lobstermen, our fishermen, our farmers, our loggers, and to our aviation and motor coach industries. We need more assistance for childcare and for the U.S. Postal Service.

Now is the time to move forward on this bill, on this proposal, to extend and strengthen the PPP before we lose more small businesses, before their employees are forced out of their jobs. So let's act today. It is past time to put aside partisan bickering to provide this much needed relief for the American people.

I urge all of our colleagues to join us in support of this important action to renew and strengthen the PPP program.

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

NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,  
October 20, 2020.

Hon. MARCO RUBIO,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.  
Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS AND SENATOR RUBIO: The National Restaurant Association writes to you in support of the recently-filed amendment, "Continuing the Paycheck Protection Program," scheduled for a vote today.

As you know all too well, the restaurant industry has been uniquely hard-hit by the COVID-19 pandemic. Our industry has lost more jobs and more revenue than any other. Over the past 7 months, nearly one in six restaurants (representing roughly 100,000 establishments) have closed, and more than 2 million restaurant employees are still without a job today as a result of furloughs and closures. The restaurant industry is on track to lose a staggering \$240 billion in revenue by the end of this year.

Since March, the National Restaurant Association has called for a comprehensive, restaurant-specific response from Congress to assist the nation's second-largest private-sector employer. We continue to call for this, but a comprehensive agreement seems unlikely before the elections, and restaurants are in danger of being left behind.

If Congress cannot approve comprehensive support this year, a second round of funding for the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) will at least provide transitional support for restaurants as we approach the winter months. We appreciate your leadership in developing the PPP, in providing more flexibility in its use, and for your calls to ensure that Congress does not leave Washington without providing something for the short-term survival of restaurants.

On behalf of our membership, our state restaurant association partners, and our workforce, we urge the Congress to at a minimum pass a second round of PPP for implementation this year.

Sincerely,

SEAN KENNEDY,

*Executive Vice President, Public Affairs.*

NFIB,

*October 20, 2020.*

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of NFIB, the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I write in strong support of the Continuing the Paycheck Protection Program Act offered by Senators Marco Rubio and Susan Collins. This amendment would provide necessary and targeted financial assistance to small businesses for the purposes of keeping workers employed and keeping their doors open during the ongoing public health crisis. A vote to advance the Continuing the Paycheck Protection Program Act amendment will be considered an NFIB Key Vote for the 116th Congress.

The Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) has been a vital financial assistance tool to over 5 million small businesses, helping these businesses maintain employees and assisting with expenses such as rent, utilities, and mortgage interest. Unfortunately, the negative economic consequences of COVID-19 on small businesses have lasted longer than Congress anticipated when the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act was enacted in late March.

The amendment provides more than \$250 billion in funds to allow for second PPP loans for small businesses if they demonstrate 35% quarterly revenue loss this year. NFIB supports allowing a small business to receive a second PPP loan. The opportunity for second PPP loans would significantly help small businesses who continue to be negatively impacted by economic disruptions of COVID-19.

Additionally, the amendment expands the definition of PPP expenses to include certain operational expenditures, property damage costs, certain supplier costs, and worker protection expenditures, as well as allows small business borrowers to select a flexible covered period to utilize their PPP loan funds. NFIB supports expanding eligible expenses to help small businesses cover essential reopening and operational expenses and providing flexibility regarding timing of PPP expenditures.

The amendment also simplifies the PPP loan forgiveness process, allowing small businesses who received a loan of \$150,000 or less to attest to a good faith effort to comply with PPP loan requirements and obtain forgiveness. NFIB supports providing a more efficient way to demonstrate compliance and receive forgiveness as the vast majority of small business owners have exhausted their PPP funds and are preparing to apply for forgiveness.

Economic conditions are putting significant stress on the financial health of many small business owners struggling to balance lower sales with fixed expenses, and longer-term sustainability. More than one-in-five (21%) small business owners report that they will have to close their doors if current economic conditions do not improve over the next six months. With the realization that lower than average sales are likely for months to come, many small business owners urgently need additional financial assistance. According to NFIB's most recent survey, 49% of small business owners who received PPP loan and/or an Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) anticipate needing additional financial support in the next 12 months.

There is bipartisan agreement to provide a targeted second round of PPP loans to small

businesses. NFIB urges Congress to set aside disagreements on other policies and pass legislation to help small business owners immediately.

NFIB strongly supports the Continuing the Paycheck Protection Program Act amendment and a vote to advance the legislation will be considered an NFIB Key Vote for the 116th Congress.

Sincerely,

KEVIN KUHLMAN,

*Vice President, Federal Government Relations, NFIB.*

HOSPITALITY MAINE.

Senator SUSAN COLLINS,  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: I am writing this letter in support of another round of PPP. My understanding is that there are those that feel funding restaurants through the RESTAURANTS Act should be the only hospitality funding provided in a Federal stimulus bill. As an association that represents both small lodging and restaurant businesses in the State of Maine, I can assure you that both have been hit equally as hard. In the State of Maine, one could argue that with the very stringent reopening guidelines and embargoes on certain states to come here, that our small lodging properties may have been hit harder. In a state where the average size lodging business is 14 rooms, we are not talking big business. We are speaking of mom and pop inns and bed and breakfasts that will have a difficult time surviving the winter.

We are not opposed to the RESTAURANTS Act, quite the contrary, we support it wholeheartedly, along with a reasonable form of assistance to the many other business sectors both inside and outside of the hospitality space. In Maine there are windjammers, attractions, museums, music venues and yes small inns and hotels that could also use some help. Let's make sure we don't leave them behind.

Sincerely,

GREG DUGAL,

*Director of Government Affairs.*

AMERICAN HOTEL & LODGING

ASSOCIATION,

*October 20, 2020.*

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
*Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,  
*Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL AND LEADER SCHUMER: On behalf of the American Hotel & Lodging Association (AHLA), the sole national association representing all segments of the U.S. lodging industry, including iconic global brands, hotel owners and franchisees, lodging real estate investment trusts (REITs), hotel management companies, independent properties, bed and breakfasts, state hotel associations, and industry suppliers, I write in strong support of the Continuing the Paycheck Protection Program Act (S. 4773) introduced by Senators Susan Collins (R-ME) and Marco Rubio (R-FL). This important legislation would enable hotels and other small businesses access to a second draw of the historic and bipartisan Paycheck Protection Program, giving them a financial lifeline to keep their employees on the payroll and doors open.

The hotel industry continues to be decimated by the COVID-19 pandemic. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), the leisure and hospitality space has lost 4.1 million jobs since February and the accommodations sector has an unemployment rate of 34.5% compared to the national average of 8.4%. The human toll on our employees and

our workforce is devastating. The economic impact to our industry is equally as dramatic, estimated to be nine times greater than the September 11th terrorist attacks. According to Oxford Economics, the industry is expected to lose more than fifty percent of its total revenue in 2020.

In a recent survey of hotel employers, AHLA found that 74% of hoteliers reported they would be forced into further layoffs without additional government support, such as a second PPP draw. Nearly half of hotel owners reported that they are in danger of foreclosure due to the pandemic. The hotel industry desperately needs additional relief to survive this crisis.

On behalf of the more than 33,000 small business hotels and the millions of associates they employ, I urge you to support this legislation and to allow the many thousands of hotel owners across the country access to this program. Without immediate relief from Congress, hotel businesses and the jobs they provide will be lost permanently. Thank you for your consideration of this critical matter.

Sincerely,

BRIAN CRAWFORD,

*Executive Vice President, Government Affairs.*

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, first, I would like to commend my colleague, the Senator from Maine, for her absolute, unquestioned leadership in this issue of paycheck protection. She knows, in Maine, as I do in Wyoming, the importance of small businesses to our communities, to our Main Streets, to the vitality of our economies, and she has led the fight from the beginning of coronavirus to make sure our businesses would remain viable; that they would have opportunities to keep people on the payroll; that they can continue to contribute to their communities.

She was the one who brought up this idea in the first place, shepherded it all the way through Congress as part of the CARES Act, and continues in that leadership role today.

I come here today on the floor to first commend my colleague from Maine and also to talk about the ongoing fight against coronavirus and the plan forward, guided by data and doctors, to put the disease behind us and let all of these small businesses that the Senator from Maine has been working to allow to continue to strive and to thrive.

Those in the fight against the virus—and I talk to you as a doctor now—continue to hold our respect and our admiration. They are doing remarkable work in community hospitals and clinics all around the country. And across the country, as a result of the PPP program, our Main Streets are getting a little busier; our economy is gaining strength; kids are going back to school; and even some football is being played.



Most importantly, we are learning more about this disease and how we can successfully treat COVID-19. What doctors and clinicians and researchers and scientists have been able to accomplish in such a relatively short period of time is nothing short of remarkable. These men and women are fighting a battle every day in the labs and the hospitals around the world; they are racing against time; and they are saving lives. They are our heroes today at work all across our Nation.

An effective vaccine will allow everyone to get back to work and to school. It will also be the protection our most vulnerable Americans desperately need: our seniors, patients with pre-existing conditions, anyone confined to a nursing home.

Congress has already directed \$10 billion for vaccine development. I, for one, and other Members of the Republican conference believe that we should be doing more. A month ago, the Senate tried to begin debate on our plan to finish the fight against coronavirus. The bill we brought to the floor of the Senate would get people back to work safely, would get kids back to school safely, and would put the disease behind us. Instead, Democrats, on this very floor—on this very floor—blocked the focused, targeted bill.

Now, this week, Democrats once again are blocking another vote on relief for coronavirus—relief that is needed all around the country; relief that I hear about in Wyoming and, Madam President, you do in West Virginia; relief that our constituents talked to us about as we travel our States.

So why are the Democrats blocking this legislation? Well, it must be something significant to make them block giving aid to the American people when the people need it most urgently. Well, maybe this is why: Maybe the Republican bill doesn't include millions of dollars in tax breaks for rich people in New York and California. The Democratic House-passed bill includes those things. Now, the Republican bill doesn't give taxpayer money to people who are in the country illegally, but the Democratic House-passed bill does do that.

The Republican bill doesn't bail out States that were mismanaged way before anyone had ever heard of the coronavirus. Well, the Democratic House-passed bill does that as well.

The Republican bill doesn't include money for marijuana banking, but the House-passed bill does all of these things.

It is hard to believe these are the reasons the Democrats are preventing coronavirus relief from reaching the President's desk, but just look at the differences in the priorities.

The Democrats are refusing money for Americans until Congress funds their laundry list of unrelated liberal items for their favored liberal special interest groups. Now, I hope the real reason this coronavirus relief bill is being blocked isn't because of an up-

coming election. I mean, I sincerely hope that Americans aren't being used to score political points or to damage political opponents. Surely, that can't be the reason. It would be unthinkable.

The Speaker and Senator SCHUMER need to set aside all of their political demands and focus on the people in need. They need to set aside the wasteful spending that is unrelated to this battle in order to save lives and set aside their opposition to more money for a lifesaving vaccine. Now is the time to make an agreement that would actually benefit Americans today. There is an urgency. We need to act, and we should act now.

To paraphrase Winston Churchill, this virus can do its worst, but we will do our best.

We are doing our best. We are doing our best to get through this together, to get a safe and effective vaccine, and to get our economy and lives back on track. It is time to pass targeted relief. This is the path forward for America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, once again, the Republican leadership is circumventing and abusing the rules of the U.S. Senate. In this Congress, this has happened over and over and over again—denying debate on the Senate floor, where we have the opportunity to offer amendments and have a debate, which the Senate is very famous historically for engaging in. I can give you numerous examples.

There is Justice in Policing. After all of the problems that we have seen around our country, there has been no opportunity on the floor of the Senate to consider legislation, to offer amendments, and have debate.

As for the environmental challenges that our Nation and world face, there has been no debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

As for gun safety, we have heard from students and communities of all of the tragedies that have occurred during this Congress, but there has been no debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate, where we would have an opportunity to offer amendments and have a full debate.

As for immigration reform, it is something that has been talked about a great deal, but there has been no real action taken on the floor of the U.S. Senate during this Congress.

With election reform, once again, there has been no debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate and no opportunity to offer amendments.

We are not doing what the American people expect us to do, and I can name

many, many, many more examples. At last count, somewhere around 400 bills have come over to us from the House of Representatives—many bipartisan—that have not been considered by the U.S. Senate.

Then, of course, the Republican leadership changes the rules when it suits itself in order to do what it wants to do, particularly with judicial confirmations. We are seeing that right now in the attempt to fill Justice Ginsburg's vacancy. They are changing the rules. The rules that apply to the Democrats don't apply to the Republicans. They do whatever they want to do. That is not what we should be doing. Now we see the Republican leadership circumventing and abusing the rules of the U.S. Senate as it relates to our responsibility with COVID-19.

Everyone knows, including the Republican leader, that we are not going to enact the bill that is currently before the Senate without the amendments being offered by the majority leader. Why are we taking up these issues? There is one simple answer: political cover votes. That is the only reason for it, but there is a consequence to this. It makes it more difficult for us to get relief to those who need it. Whether it be small businesses or whether it be our schools or whether it be our State and local governments or whether it be those who are unemployed or whether it be American families, it makes it more difficult because, as we are taking up these issues, Secretary Mnuchin, on behalf of the Trump administration, and Speaker PELOSI are negotiating, from which we hope there will be a comprehensive package to deal with COVID-19.

I must tell you that Secretary Mnuchin has a very difficult challenge. First, he has to represent the President of the United States, who changes his mind every few minutes on whether he wants a package or doesn't want a package, which makes it very difficult for Secretary Mnuchin to negotiate with Speaker PELOSI. Then he has to deal with the Republicans in the U.S. Senate. We will be voting tomorrow, I understand, on a proposal from the Republicans that will be less than one-third of the amount of money that President Trump has authorized in negotiations, pulling us further apart and making it more difficult for us to reach an agreement to help the people of this country.

Since mid-May and again several months ago, the House did its work. It sent over to us a comprehensive bill to deal with the next phase of COVID-19. There have been no efforts—none whatsoever—by the Republican leader to bring that legislation to the floor of the U.S. Senate so that we can have an open and full debate with amendments as to what to do. That bill has been here since mid-May, and we can't find the time to have that type of debate. So what is Leader MCCONNELL suggesting? You will have to follow this

because I know, if it were not so serious, the public would find it somewhat amusing.

First, he wants to withdraw the amendment that was championed by the Republicans that deals with pre-existing conditions. I must tell you that we all on our side of the aisle said that this was just another political cover vote. Now Leader MCCONNELL is making that prediction very clear by withdrawing it and offering it again later as an effort to block the Democrats from being able to offer a clean vote on an amendment. We are going to make it a clean vote anyway, but that is his motivation. He is withdrawing the amendment that deals with pre-existing conditions so that it will no longer be a part of the bill.

Then he is going to offer an amendment to the underlying message, S. 178, which is legislation that deals with sanctions against China. You heard me right. This is a message on legislation that deals with sanctions against China. It already includes the underlying amendment that Leader MCCONNELL is offering—the amendment that we are voting on in a few minutes. Then he is going to file a motion to table, which means he will want to kill the amendment. Then he is going to vote against his own motion. I hope you all can follow that.

Here is the irony or hypocrisy of all of this: If the motion to table carries, the provisions that are in the amendment are still in the underlying bill. In other words, it has no effect whatsoever because it is already in the bill. So this is a vote for one purpose only—to give political cover. The American people understand that, and they understand that this is strictly about dealing with a partisan, political type of trickery, and we should have no part of that.

Let's talk about the process that we have used. There will be no chance in this legislation of helping businesses with the passage of a comprehensive bill under the approach taken by the Republican leader. Now, there is a model we could follow. It has worked before, and it can work again. Look at the CARES Act. We had partisan differences, and we bridged those partisan differences. We worked together and put the American people's interests first. As a result, we passed the CARES Act with a proud 97-to-0 vote in the U.S. Senate and provided desperately needed help in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic itself, in dealing with the health professionals and the public health people, and for testing and for vaccine development. We provided money for State and local governments, and we provided money for businesses and taxpayers. We also dealt with unemployment insurance. We did all of that.

When we passed that bill in March, we thought this pandemic would be behind us by now and that we wouldn't still be in the first wave and be increasing the numbers of people infected with

COVID-19. We need more help, not less help, so we need a second round.

I am frustrated in regard to the provisions affecting small business. I say that because Senator RUBIO, the Republican chair of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, and I, as ranking Democrat of that committee, were proud to work together and put the interest of our country first and develop the tools that were included in the CARES Act, which included, yes, the Paycheck Protection Program, the PPP. It also included EIDL loans and grants.

It also included loan forgiveness in an effort to help small businesses. It was truly a bipartisan working effort. We were, I think, the first of the different provisions that were included in the CARES Act that were basically worked out in a bipartisan manner. But that is not the process the majority leader is following today. The proposal he is making is not a bipartisan proposal that has been worked on by Senator RUBIO and me. We haven't come together. We could easily resolve our differences; I have no doubt about it. If we get the parameters on how much money we have, and give us a few minutes to negotiate, we will come to an agreement, as we have done in the past. I have every confidence in the world that we will do it. But this process doesn't further that aim—a process that cannot lead to help for our small businesses.

Let's talk about what our small businesses need.

First, they need comprehensive help. Similar to what we did in the CARES Act, they need a second major influx of help. They need help for State and local government. Why? Because the stability of the services provided by State and local government is critically important for the climate in which small businesses need to operate to get back to some degree of normalcy.

They need help for our schools because our schools need to reopen as fully as they can safely, whether it is virtual or in classroom or hybrid, and they don't have the resources to do it. Our economy will not get back on track unless parents are confident about the educational opportunities of their children and can fully participate in our economy knowing their children are safe. Small businesses need that type of support.

They need help for the people who are unemployed. That \$600 a week went directly to helping small businesses by providing customers that use small businesses.

We have 12 million Americans who are uninsured today. We didn't anticipate that in March when we passed the CARES Act, that we would still have those numbers.

We need a comprehensive approach, and, yes, we need to get COVID-19 under control. We need confidence among Americans that it is OK to go out and shop and use services and par-

ticipate fully in our economy. But until they are confident they can do that safely, the economy will not rebound the way it needs to. So small businesses need a comprehensive approach.

Food services are still doing very poorly, and now we are entering into the cold months, when it is more difficult to eat outdoors. It means restaurants are going to need more help, not less.

The hospitality industry is still very much impacted by COVID-19. We know that there are no large gatherings or events. The travel and tourism industry has taken a hit. I saw that during COVID-19, during the summer months, down on the beaches when the normal crowds were not there. We will see it again this winter in the western part of our State, as we see fewer people are traveling to Deep Creek Lake.

We all recognize that we need to give attention to these types of conditions to get consumers back, that this economy is OK, to help small business.

Now, the House has acted not once but twice, and Senator MCCONNELL instead brings up a bill one-third the offer the President—less than one-third of the offer the President has already put on the table and probably about a quarter—less than a quarter of what the Democrats have passed in their most recent bill.

So Senator MCCONNELL is going to first file an amendment that would provide a second round of the Paycheck Protection Program. I agree we should have a second round of the Paycheck Protection Program. We need a second round—that is nothing new. We have had hearings in our committee where Secretary Mnuchin acknowledged that, the Democrats acknowledged it, and the Republicans acknowledged it.

I filed legislation in June with Senator SHAHEEN on a second round of PPP—in June. It is now October, and we haven't brought that bill to the floor so we could reconcile differences if we were going to bring it up on its own, if it is not going to be part of a comprehensive package. But what Leader MCCONNELL is saying is we are going to bring it up on our own, but it doesn't take into consideration the lessons we learned from the Paycheck Protection Program, the first round.

What did we learn? We learned that underbanked, underserved communities were not treated fairly; that they didn't have the relationship with the banks that allow them to get the money in a timely way, get as large of a loan as the more established small businesses were able to get; that the lenders were more likely to do business with those who had existing relations, with the larger loans; and that we needed to empower the mission lenders who go into underserved communities and we needed to concentrate on the smaller and the smallest of the small businesses. If you look at what is being brought forward today, the legislation does not adequately provide for the underserved community.

We also learned from the first round of help in the CARES Act about the importance of the Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program, the EIDL Program. Now, you see, the EIDL Program provides loans, and those loans are critically important because that is working capital. That is not just payroll; it is working capital. Small businesses need long-term, low-interest EIDL loans that are able to be paid over a long period of time and to get a break in the first year or two where they don't even have to make payments.

They needed the EIDL loans, but we also created an EIDL grant program. Now, I must tell you something. Many small businesses—particularly the smaller of the small businesses—are reluctant to take out any more loans. They don't know how they are going to pay them off. They need grants. They need grants. We provided originally \$10 billion and then another \$10 billion. We provided \$20 billion, but that is gone. We need to replenish that money for the grant program. The amendment the leader is bringing up doesn't provide any help for that grant program.

In addition, we need to think more strategically about grants under the EIDL Program, and there is a way of doing that. I will come back to that in a minute. It is not in the leader's amendment.

We need to do something about the arbitrary cap that the administration placed on the EIDL loans. They placed a \$150,000 cap. The law says \$2 million. They compromised the effectiveness of this.

Now, here is the good news. We have bipartisan support for these changes. Senator ROSEN and Senator CORNYN have filed legislation that would allow us to move forward with the EIDL Program, but it is not in the amendment being offered by the majority leader.

There are so many other programs in the small business field that are important. There is the loan forgiveness program—Senator COONS worked on that—that forgives loans for 6 months under the 504 and the 7(a) programs. We can reduce the cost of small business loans. We can approve microloans. I could mention so many other areas where we could provide help.

We know we have specific industries that need special attention, such as the restaurant industry, such as local newspapers, such as nonprofits that weren't covered under the first PPP program. Those are not covered under Leader MCCONNELL's amendment.

Here is the tragedy: There is no opportunity under this process for us to correct errors in Senator MCCONNELL's amendment. No chance to amend. Never had a chance to amend. Never went through the committee. And, by the way, is on a bill unrelated to this relief and has no chance of passage.

That is not what we should be doing. We have other options. We could bring the revised House Heroes bill to the floor of the U.S. Senate. It is a com-

prehensive approach. It has been compromised. We could open it to amendment. We could debate it and pass it and provide comprehensive relief. It includes all of the small business provisions that I mentioned earlier. They are included in the House-passed bill. They passed a couple weeks ago.

If Leader MCCONNELL is just determined to bring a small business bill to the floor, then I have filed such legislation today with many of my colleagues—a bill that works with issues of concern to small businesses, which is very much bipartisan. It includes not only the second round of PPP but also includes important help for the underbanked communities and mission lenders. It provides real help for the smaller of the small businesses. It increases the EIDL Program—similar to the Rosen-Cornyn bill but also adds a new opportunity for grants under the EIDL Program. It strengthens programs in areas for the hospitality industry, for our local newspapers, for our nonprofits. It provides help in many of the small business existing programs, such as the loan forgiveness program. The cost of small business loans are reduced. Microloans are improved.

We could bring up that legislation, and then we have a bill that really deals with small business that can be debated, amended. We can have amendments and vote on it. But at least we have a comprehensive bill that has a chance of being enacted. Why do I say it has a chance of being enacted? Because the House has already acted on this. It is included in their package. We don't have to try to conference this.

Look, we should have passed this months ago, but we all know elections are coming up in 2 weeks. We have to act if we are going to act. Here is a bill we can act on now and get done because we know the House has already voted on a similar package.

We know small businesses need help. They are in desperate need of help. Our economy needs help. Americans need the Senate to stop playing procedural political games and to be serious about taking up legislation that can deal with their needs.

I am ready at any time to sit down with my Republican colleagues and work out such legislation, but the way the majority leader is going about this is just wrong, and it should not be supported by any of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I don't know of any topic that is more supported around here than the helping of small businesses. I think the biggest evidence of that is that I would venture to guess almost every Member of this body has at some point gone back home and bragged about what we were able to achieve together in a bipartisan way.

And to remind everybody, this program has never existed before. It was put together in a bipartisan way with

the ranking member, the Senator from Maryland you just heard from. We worked on it—I think it was 6 or 7 days. And it wasn't a perfect program. Like anything new, this big, that fast, it had some hiccups, and we worked in a bipartisan way with the administration to implement it.

I will say this without any reservation: It was by far the single most effective piece of that CARES package, and there isn't a day that goes by when I am back in Florida or, frankly, anywhere in the country that I don't hear about it. I don't know anyone who hasn't. One of the most common themes when we go places is a small business owner who says PPP was a lifesaver, and then they ask: Is there more on the way, because we are still struggling?

That it is a lifesaver is without question. I mean, I look at Florida. Over 430,000 of these PPP loans—which, really, in most cases are going to end up being grants—were made. That is \$32 billion of relief into our economy. The ranking member's home State—87,000. I looked at some other States just quickly on the way over here. Iowa, 61,000. In North Carolina, 129,000 of these were made. Michigan, 128,000. Arizona, 85,000. In Colorado, 109,000 of these were made. Montana, 23,000. The State of Maine, where Senator COLLINS was a key part of all this, 28,000. Georgia, neighboring Florida, 174,000. I could go on and on.

Another thing we should be really proud about as far as PPP is that two-thirds of the loans—the grants—were under \$50,000, which tells you about the size of these businesses. In fact, 70 percent—70 percent—of these were made to businesses that had 10 employees or fewer. By far, it was the most effective thing we did.

You can look at the jobs figures. I have this chart up here just to show it. PPP and small business employment—you look at the precipitous dropoff in March, and then once PPP began to get disbursed, you see those numbers, and as the disbursement goes up, the chart goes up.

Now, are they perfect? No. Will we want it back up here? Of course. Are there businesses that didn't make it? Sadly, yes. But there are people working right now. There are small businesses that were going to be wiped off the face of this country's economy that are open to this day because of what we were able to do. But it expired, meaning that you could only get it once. There was a date where it cut off. The ranking member wisely moved and we all agreed and we were able to extend it by another month to help people apply, but now you can't go back.

So what do you do? You are a business or restaurant, for example, and you used PPP once and have expended that money over 24 weeks, and now you are in the same boat or potentially in the same place you were back in March and April. The money is gone, the customers aren't back yet, and you are

about to close and people are about to get laid off. So we need to do a second round.

There are a lot of other things we can do for small business—I agree with that wholeheartedly—but this is one that I think we have to do because there is tremendous agreement. The reason it is not happening is because, No. 1, some people think of it as leverage. Everyone likes PPP, so let's hold out on it. Let's not do it until it is part of a broader package of things unrelated to small business because it is so popular. It is the carrot that will bring everybody toward supporting the broader deal.

That may have made sense back in May or June, but not now, not in October, not since we have long since expended the moneys that these companies received, and now they are facing the same situation they were back in March and early April. Now we have to do what we can.

I don't think we can fall—unfortunately, we have, but it is not very smart to fall into this habit of saying that if we can't do everything, we shouldn't do anything. That is just across the board. There are a lot of other areas that we need to provide COVID relief in—I agree with that—but we are not going to do it in 6 days. We should have done it a long time ago. It didn't come to that. But this is one piece I think we can all agree on. Even if they are small businesses—and I only caught the tail end of what he was saying. The ranking member points to a lot of other things we could do to help small business. I agree with that. There are things beyond PPP that would help them. The fundamental challenge we have here is that we have a limited amount of time to get this thing done, and I appreciate the idea that the House already passed it. But the thing is, that is not something that is going to become law. That is the reality. Just like there are things we want on this side that are not going to become law, because to pass a law right now in Washington requires passage in a Senate with a Republican majority, but there are not 60 Republicans, so we need Democratic votes. We need this body to pass it, and we need a Democratically controlled House to pass it and a Republican President to sign it. That is just basic math in terms of what it takes. That is just the basic outline of what it takes to turn whatever it is we are talking about here into a law to actually help people.

If you want to help people, we have to figure out something that at least 60 people in the Senate and a majority in the House will agree on and that the President will sign. The one thing I know for sure that could get that, if we just had a straight up-or-down vote on it, is the notion of extending a second round of PPP assistance to a targeted number of small businesses. That is it.

Now, is that everything I want to do? No. I want us to do more. By the way, if we can figure something more to do

in the meantime, that would be great, but this must happen. There is no way of explaining to people: Hold on a second. Everybody agrees that we need to do more just to extend PPP.

Well, why haven't you done it?

Then you have to explain: Well, because there were nine other things we wanted to do for small business, but because we couldn't agree on those, we didn't do the one we agreed on; or, there was a bunch of things non-small-business related that we wanted to get done, and because those didn't happen, we are holding up the whole thing.

People don't understand it. That doesn't make sense in the real world to anybody.

The bottom line is this: We have a basic formula here that, if we put aside those considerations, could get support and could pass pretty quickly. The other issues are still going to be there, and we should do them, too, but we shouldn't hold this up in order to do that.

That is what we are going to have a chance to do here in a few minutes. If we don't, if we don't, then we will have to explain—all of us—to people why it is that this is being held up. If you tell them it is because people want leverage for more stuff, they are not going to understand that. It is very simple.

For anyone watching now or for anyone who watches this later, it is a simple concept. We have before us right now the ability to help—to the tune of close to \$250 billion—millions of small business workers across this country and their employers, to keep them on payroll, to stay open for a few more months while we get through this pandemic. We have a chance to do it through a model that we know works, a model that was recently used. We just re-up that for a second round to a targeted number of small businesses, under a certain number of employees, facing certain revenue constraints. We even open it up to some additional not-for-profits. We have a chance to do that. We have all these other things that we should do as well, and we should do those, too, but we shouldn't wait for those things to do this thing, to help right now.

This is not theoretical. Right now, at this very moment, there are thousands upon thousands of small businesses that are holding on, on a week-by-week basis. Whether or not they can survive isn't up to them. It is up to whether the local government allows them to open and at what capacity. It is up to whether their customers have the financial wherewithal to go back and visit or spend.

The businesses we are talking about are restaurants, absolutely; live venues, absolutely; and all those other places that have been hurt in hospitality, without a doubt. But other businesses are being hurt too. I know a dry-cleaner in South Florida who is being hurt. You might ask, why? They are allowed to open. Well, because when people stopped working and going to cer-

tain places, they spent less money on drycleaning. Now a place that had eight employees now has six, and of the six, four are only part time. They will have an opportunity, if they get PPP, to keep that workforce employed full time, and it would matter to those families.

We can do this. Doing this doesn't mean we don't do anything else. Those other issues still have to be addressed. But let's at least do this. It isn't everything, but it is a lot, and it is something, and it will matter, and there is no reason not to do it. It will in no way keep us from doing the other things that need to be done.

Again, just because we are not going to do everything in one shot should not mean that we don't do something. We have a chance to do something, and it is meaningful, and it is a model that we know works, and it is a model we have all supported in the past, and it is one that I hope that in the next few minutes some people will change their minds on and support now because to not do something is inexplicable. It would make no sense.

There are real people in the real world who are just trying to hold on and can't figure out why it is we are here and we can't do something to help them at their hour of greatest need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today to speak on behalf of people and small businesses in Michigan that are being left behind on this Republican bill. As my friend from Florida has said, we can do something. The Senate Democratic leader is going to be offering us an opportunity to vote on something comprehensive that has been passed by the House that doesn't leave small businesses, families, healthcare providers, and the need for testing and tracing behind.

When I think about who is being left behind in this bill, I think of the single mom of two boys who is seeing her hours cut, and her paycheck has shrunk, and she is left behind by what we are being asked to vote on right now. There is no need for that. She doesn't know how she is going to keep the lights on. The weather is getting cold.

The 83-year-old retiree who is struggling to afford food and who goes to bed hungry night after night is being left behind on what we are being asked to vote on. That doesn't have to happen. We have an alternative that has passed the House that we can vote on and get this done today.

The owner of a small restaurant is being left behind. He has been able to stay open by offering takeout, but he is just barely—just barely—holding on, wanting specific help that is available through legislation introduced in the Senate, that is bipartisan, that is not in this bill. He is being left behind.

We are talking about the families who thought 2020 would be the year

they would finally get ahead, and then COVID hit, and now they are at risk of being evicted and losing their homes that brought their children stability for the first time.

There are the Michigan families who have lost loved ones—more than 7,000 grandmas and grandpas and moms and dads, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, cousins, neighbors, and friends.

People in Michigan aren't talking about a stimulus bill; they want a survival package because it is survival for them right now. Instead, Republicans have introduced a bill that leaves our urgent health care needs, our families, and far too many businesses behind.

This Republican proposal leaves behind the most important thing we need to do right now to get the pandemic under control. President Trump has said that we will wake up one day and COVID-19 will have miraculously gone away. Oh, wouldn't that be great. But we are tired of waiting and getting up every day and being faced with the threat of COVID-19.

If we want people to send their kids to school, reopen their businesses, get back to work, be able to go shopping at their small businesses, to be able to eat at their restaurants, then we need to make sure things are safe. Right now, it is not safe.

COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations and deaths are spiking all across the country. The White House is still resisting a national testing strategy, as if it is some kind of giveaway to Democrats instead of public health 101.

Meanwhile, millions of people have lost their jobs, which means they have also lost their health insurance, which he doesn't want to address, and our healthcare system is under strain. Our hospitals and our nursing homes are still struggling to get enough personal protective equipment for their employees, for families who want to visit, and for patients. Our healthcare professionals are exhausted, stressed, and at severe risk of burnout. Healthcare needs are left behind in this bill, and so are the needs of our families.

Right now, the unemployment rate in Michigan is 8.5 percent—higher than the national average. Since March 15, 2.3 million Michigan residents have relied on unemployment. The extra \$600 a week provided in the CARES Act was a lifeline for these Michigan families, and it needs to be extended so they can have a roof over their heads and pay their bills and survive. A survey last month by the U.S. Census Bureau found that 25 percent of Michigan residents thought they would be evicted or lose their home to foreclosure in the next 2 months.

We need to act now—now. We have an opportunity. The Senate Democratic leader will give us the opportunity to vote on that bill and act now. Without additional unemployment aid and rental assistance, where will these families go in January when the CDC eviction moratorium expires and they are months behind in rent?

This legislation also leaves our children behind. The Republican bills have not provided adequate funding to reopen our schools safely, and millions of parents, including my own daughter and her family and my own son and his family, are juggling, trying to make sure that kids can work online, trying to make sure they are getting the education they need. It is hard.

The money that has been provided in the bill, unfortunately, in the underlying bill—there is some, but it comes with strings attached. Schools must physically reopen in order to receive their fair share of funding. So if your school district has decided that COVID cases have gone up and it is not safe for the children to go back to school—they are still paying the teachers, they are operating remotely, and they have all the costs of operating remotely, but if they are not physically there, as President Trump insists on, physically there regardless of the health risk, they would not get the help they need for our children to be educated—quite a change for a political party that likes to talk about local control.

But there is one exception. If your child is going to a private school, you get a great big tax credit if you send your child to a private school rather than a public school, like the vast majority of children in our country.

Brecken is a 5-year-old kindergarten student in the De Tour area public schools in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. She has access to high-speed internet in only one way, and that is if her parents disconnect every other electronic device in their house while she is doing her studies. And the connection isn't great. Brecken and other students in rural areas deserve the same internet connectivity that their city friends enjoy, but the Republicans leave them behind.

Democrats have proposed a \$4 billion E-rate funding increase to ensure children are able to go to school remotely. We don't want Brecken or any child left behind in this COVID-19 crisis.

We can't talk about schools without talking about healthy food and nutrition. They go hand in hand. The average person getting help right now—food assistance—receives \$127 a month, which is \$1.40 per meal. About 40 percent of our families who are getting even that have gotten absolutely no increased help whatsoever. And we know in the food lines, people who have donated to the food banks all their lives are now sitting in their car for hours sometimes, waiting to go through the food line themselves. Our families need help. Our families are hungry. We can fix that if we pass the bill that the House sent to us.

Finally, this legislation isn't just about leaving critical healthcare needs and testing needs behind, leaving our children and leaving our families behind. It leaves far too many businesses behind. Over the past few months, I have met with so many Michigan business owners, mostly over Zoom—res-

taurants, gyms, entertainment venues, craft jewelry, theaters that have been revitalizing Michigan downtowns. One of the things I love is that not just in big cities but in small towns across Michigan, you will go downtown, and there is now a craft brewery, and then they have rebuilt and revitalized a historic theater, and they are rebuilding the downtown. They have been hit so hard by what has happened with COVID-19. They deserve specific help that they are not getting in this legislation.

All small businesses are not getting the help—the kind of help—that they need. We don't want to leave any small business behind, including our minority-owned small businesses in underserved communities and nonprofits. We fought successfully, as Democrats, to add \$30 billion in dedicated funding for those who are underbanked or receiving their financial support in other nontraditional ways. That is not in here either.

So we need an approach for this pandemic and the economic catastrophe it has unleashed across the country. We need an approach that is serious and is bold—neither of which is what we are about to vote on with this PPP vote—for testing and healthcare, for keeping our children safe so they can get back to school, for our families and all of our businesses.

We know that so many have been hit in ways that are different than others, so we need to address all of our small businesses. This is no time to leave any of them behind, and the Republican initiative in front of us does just that. People deserve better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I do want to say that we are here at a time when the Republican Party is jamming yet another nominee through bizarre procedural practices onto the Supreme Court.

We have examined in the Judiciary Committee some of the ways in which the funding for that operation flows from big anonymous donors who use the Federalist Society as a conduit to buy a seat at the table where our Supreme Court Justices are selected, and then, with contributions as big as \$17 million, pays for campaign ads for the nominee who has been selected and then sends an entire flotilla of front groups in an orchestrated chorus to go and argue together before the Supreme Court as if they were different.

What I want to say today is that we have been looking at this captured court problem for a while, and we are releasing this "What's at Stake" report on what it means for climate and the environment because who is behind the scheme to capture the court are primarily the big polluters who want protection from courts that will be friendly to their interests.

I will speak more about this and about why they are willing to spend

what the Washington Post has calculated as \$250 million in dark money to affect this court-capture operation. What is the payback for them?

I am here for this episode of my "Time to Wake Up" series, which has an interesting overlay with what is happening in the Senate because we are considering the nomination of Judge Barrett to go on the Supreme Court. Her nomination completes a series of three nominations to the Supreme Court consecutively, each of which has been distinguished by extremely unusual procedural maneuvering and even rule-breaking within the Senate and the Judiciary Committee to get those nominations pushed through. So we have been looking for some time at what the motivation is behind all of that pressure and what the explanation is for all of those bizarre procedural anomalies that we see over and over and over again.

As I described in the Judiciary hearing, what we see is an operation that has brought big, anonymous special interests to the table, where Justices are selected by virtue of their writing big checks. The vehicle for this has been the Federalist Society, which has a fine role on college campuses as a conservative discussion and student group and which has a relatively fine role in Washington as a think tank—as fine as think tanks are. Yet it also has this additional role of taking money from big special interests, not disclosing who they are, and giving them a seat at the table when the Federalist Society is selecting Justices, and that is wrong. There is just no doubt about that being wrong.

Then, once the Justices are selected, guess what. Ad campaigns get launched in support of them, and checks get written as big as \$17 million to support the ad campaigns. Again, the donors are anonymous. It is very weird. Then, finally, they get on the Court, and these little flotillas of amici curiae—friends of the court, people who file briefs—come into the Court by the dozen. They don't disclose it in their briefs, but if you dig back a little bit, you will find that many of them have common funding and that the amicus curiae performance before the Court is an orchestrated performance—again, anonymously funded.

So what brings that to today is that Senator MERKLEY has led our effort with this report: "What's at Stake: Climate and the Environment. How Captured Courts Rig the System for Corporate Polluters."

I want to express my appreciation to Senator MERKLEY for his hard work on this report and to his staff for its report. He has been joined by me, TOM UDALL, DEBBIE STABENOW, ED MARKEY, DICK BLUMENTHAL, SHERROD BROWN, BRIAN SCHATZ, and MARTIN HEINRICH. We are proud of this work. This is one of seven follow-on reports to our original Captured Courts report.

One of the things that I pointed out when I was discussing this in the Judi-

ciary Committee was that the Washington Post's investigation into this scheme, which was a fairly robust investigation; I have to give it good marks—tallied up the amount of anonymous money that it could connect to the network of groups that is performing this scheme at \$250 million. This \$250 million is a lot of money. A quarter of a billion dollars is a lot of money. I have people say: No. No. It couldn't possibly be true that they have spent \$250 million on this effort to capture the Court. Who spends that kind of money?

So I want to walk through an example of how this money gets paid back after it is spent, and I will use just one example, one case.

Back in the Obama administration, in order to deal with climate change, the Environmental Protection Agency created a Clean Power Plan to allow different States to set targets for themselves and try to meet those emissions reductions targets. That was challenged in court.

The case went to the Supreme Court, where 5 to 4, with what I call the Roberts Five—no Democrat but the Republican appointees who are actively engaged in this process—did something very unusual. They granted what is called an interlocutory stay. Interlocutory stays are virtually unheard of. In fact, I believe this was actually the first.

So objecting States—primarily States with fossil fuel industries—went to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. They objected to this and asked for a stay, and the DC Circuit said: No. You can appeal the rule, but go through the ordinary process. We are not going to stay it.

They then went running up to the Supreme Court, where the five Republican appointees granted the stay. Again, I don't think that had ever happened before, an interlocutory stay.

So let's do a little bit of math about just that one decision. Let's start with the International Monetary Fund, which is not a green organization by anybody's likes, I don't think, but it is pretty good at financial analysis, and it has come up with a number. In the United States alone—just in the United States—the fossil fuel industry enjoys an annual subsidy of \$600 billion with a "b." That is the IMF's calculation. It is actually a little bit north of that, but I have rounded it to 600 for these purposes, primarily because the industry gets away with not paying for what economists call its negative externalities. They get to pollute for free, and, basically, that is a violation of every rule of market economics.

I do not care how conservative the economist is that you go to. The conservative heroes of economics from the Chicago school have said: Yes, when it is pollution, it should be charged to the polluter and should be baked into the price of the product; otherwise, the market is failing, and you have a subsidy.

So a \$600 billion subsidy every year, and the Clean Power Plan case was in 2016. It was in February of 2016. It is now October of 2020, so more than 4 years have passed. But, again, let me just round it down, and let's say that it has been 4 years. Four years at \$600 billion a year is \$2.4 trillion—\$2.4 trillion.

Let's assume that the Clean Power Plan, had it been implemented, would have reduced the \$600 billion annual subsidy. Let's be really, really, really, really conservative, and let's assume that the effect the Clean Power Plan would have had on the fossil fuel industry would have been to reduce that by 1 percent—just 1 percent. So over those 4 years, that \$2.4 trillion would have been reduced to one one-hundredth of that. One one-hundredth of \$2.4 trillion is \$24 billion. Now, I think the Clean Power Plan would have had a lot more of an effect on this calculation, as companies had to clean up their act, than 1 percent, but I am taking a really low number just to make the point.

Six hundred billion is a little bit low, 4 years is a little bit low, and 1 percent is probably very low, but when you put it together, the mathematics gets you to \$24 billion that the industry saved by being able to go to this court and have it do the unusual thing—the unprecedented thing—of putting a stay on the Environmental Protection Agency.

So if you are comparing—remember where we started on this was how shocking it was that somebody might spend \$250 million in dark money to produce a court that would do unprecedented things like stay the regulation? Well, you do \$250 million into \$24 billion, it is a 100-to-1 return on your investment. Put in a penny, get back dollar. Put in a dollar, get back 100 bucks. Put in \$250 million, get back \$24 billion.

That is assuming this is the only case in which this mattered. As I have pointed out from this desk over and over again, we are now up to 80 cases in which, on a 5-to-4 basis, with a partisan makeup to the 5-to-4 and with a big Republican donor interest at stake, the court has ruled for the big Republican donor interest 80 times. The score is 80 to 0, to be clear. So this is just one of those 80—a big one, mind you. A big one. These are big bucks that are involved but just 1 of those 80.

So don't be surprised when the Washington Post reports that big, big, big corporate interests are willing to put \$250 million into a scheme to pack the courts with judges who will make the "right" decision for the big corporate interests—not once, not twice, not 10 times, but 80 times—because just that one decision alone paid back the whole \$250 million 99 times more. That is what we are up against, and that is why I am so determined to get to the bottom of what is going on, because everybody going into that Supreme Court has a right to an honest decision. Everybody has a right to a court that is deciding cases on their true merits and not because of "conservative activists"



behind-the-scenes campaign to remake the nation's courts in a way that makes people who give \$250 million in dark money the big winners."

Madam President, at this point, I yield to my wonderful colleague Senator MERKLEY, and thank him for his leadership on the "What's at Stake: Climate and the Environment" report that we are speaking about today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, what is at stake with our climate and the environment? Our planet. Our planet is on fire, literally. Historic wildfires are leaving our forests and rural communities in ashes. Oceans are growing hotter and more acidic, devastating sea life from the shellfish of Oregon to the coral reefs of the Great Barrier Reef.

There is so much damage, not just to the natural world but to our tourists and fishing industries, to our forest industry, and to our farming industry, the pillars of our rural economy both in America and around the world. More frequent and more devastating storms damaging crops, flooding cities, destroying coastal communities—the climate crisis is a clear and present danger. We are barreling headfirst at full speed toward catastrophic, irreversible climate chaos, and these special interests that my colleague just spoke about and which we expose in this report are using every tool at their disposal, especially the courts, not to stop the damage but to accelerate the carnage.

It shouldn't be too surprising that they should turn to these strategies. They can't turn to the citizens of the United States because protecting our world is popular among the American people. They favor clean air. They favor clean water. They think our government has a responsibility to protect that air and water and land, and, more broadly, to protect our planet.

In fact, 70 percent of Americans say government is not doing enough to reduce the effects of climate chaos, and they are so right. That is why the fossil fuel companies know that they can't win outright based on their arguments—or certainly not based on their ideas. No one says "I want more lead in my water" or "I want more climate-damaging carbon dioxide or methane in the air."

So what do you do if you can't win fairly? You rig the outcome. You fund bogus research. You spend huge sums with media to publicize that bogus research. You increase your influence through a vast, large legal team. You build a powerful lobbying team on Capitol Hill and every State capital across this Nation. You handpick candidates, and you fund their campaigns. You seek to take over control of an entire political party.

But Members of Congress come and go, and even when the deck is stacked, there is that possibility of a grassroots uprising of American people to over-

turn your carefully laid plans to control the American Government. So what do you do? Strategy No. 7, perhaps the most powerful strategy of all—you bias the courts. Once you get someone on the Federal bench, they are there for life. They can't be tossed out by a vote of the people, and they wield immense influence over the laws and regulations, certainly over our environmental laws and regulations. If you control the courts, especially the Supreme Court—even if you lose the White House, even if you lose the House and Senate, even if you lose all three at once—you have immense power over the laws of our land.

Our Constitution was framed to build a government of, by, and for this people. But with control of the courts, the privileged few—the fossil fuel barons—have created, instead, government by and for the powerful. That is why we saw such a committed effort by our colleagues on this side of the aisle to block President Obama from filling hundreds of open seats on the Federal bench. That is why we saw the theft of the Supreme Court seat for the first time in U.S. history 5 years ago. That is why the present majority leader is obsessed with ramming through more than 200 overwhelmingly White male, life-tenured judges, most of whom weren't chosen for their qualifications but for their rightwing ideology. And it is why 86 percent of Trump's nominees to the Supreme Court and the appellate courts are members of the Federalist Society.

The Federalist Society, created in the 1980s—as described in the book, "The Lie That Binds"—implemented an anti-Democratic policy agenda and political philosophy through a court system impervious to the will of the voters. It started one weekend with 200 conservative students and professors at Yale Law School, including Antonin Scalia, and it grew into the present-day shadowy behemoth promoting lawyers into prominent positions and starring far-right judges at every level of the bench to further corporate control—the powerful and privileged few over the will of the people.

How are they funded? Untold millions from polluters and other corporate interests that benefit from judges who strike down environmental laws and related regulations enacted and pursued by the people.

The Federalist Society is now, under Donald Trump, in charge of judicial nominations. He asked them to give him a list of whom he should nominate, and so it goes. The Federalist Society put Neil Gorsuch on that list, and President Trump nominated him. Justice Gorsuch, who said in the Chevron doctrine, a landmark decision that is the basis of 4 years of administrative and mariner law, which gives courts deference to administrative agencies and reasonable interpretations of statutes—ruled it should be overturned.

The Federalist Society put Brett Kavanaugh on that list, and President

Trump nominated him. Whenever the DC Circuit Court ruled to hold a corporate polluter accountable, Kavanaugh could be counted on to be in opposition of holding that corporation accountable. Observers call him a conservative critic of sweeping environmental regulations and a disaster for the environment.

The Federalist Society put Amy Barrett on that list, and Trump dutifully nominated her. Amy Coney Barrett refused to answer whether climate change is real during her confirmation hearing. Her record is clear. In one case she ruled that a park preservation group couldn't sue to block a construction project in Chicago's Jackson Park. She signed an opinion that reversed the lower court decision that protected wetlands from being developed under the Clean Water Act.

Earthjustice, an environmental nonprofit, remarked that her decision signaled Barrett's willingness to interpret environmental laws of the Clean Water Act narrowly in favor of industry interests—a perfect fit with the goal of the Federalist Society.

The Federalist Society plays the tune, and their nominees dance the dance—the dance for government by and for the powerful and the dance that tramples on government by and for the people.

If President Trump loses reelection and if Republicans lose the Senate majority, still, there is this court with this decision against the environment, against the worker, against civil rights time and time again, and a court that will work to stymie every effort to save our planet.

There is a whole list of similar related positions in the lower courts with similar outcomes—corporate welfare over environmental stewardship, one judge after another after another. They are the examples of the pro-corporation, anti-environmental rulings and Trump-appointed jurists that we feared. They are the kinds of challenges that are going to stand in our way if we fight to undo the damage that this administration and its cabal of extreme rightwing allies have unleashed on our democracy and on our planet. So now we have the responsibility to act.

The report that Senator WHITEHOUSE and I are releasing today—and I applaud him for working so hard to develop this whole set of Captured Courts reports to understand the power behind the shift from government by and for the people to government by and for the powerful, because if you have read the Constitution, if you believe in "We the People," you believe in the spirit of a government that draws its very essence from the people of the United States, not from the cabal of extremely wealthy, extraordinarily White, significantly privileged, enormously powerful individuals trying to be puppet masters and destroy that vision that we so cherish.

That is why we must expose it. That is why we must fight it. That is why we

must reclaim—for the future of every child in America, certainly for the future of our environment here in the United States, certainly for the health of the planet, we must reclaim that vision of government of, by, and for the people.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Go ahead, Senator. I just wanted to see if we are going into the vote now, and, if so, whatever procedural steps you needed to take us into the vote, but I yield to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

#### PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, shortly, we will be voting on whether or not to extend the Paycheck Protection Program, which has been hugely successful in helping our small businesses keep their employees.

In Maine, three out of four small businesses have received \$2.3 billion in forgivable loans. Most important, these loans have helped to sustain 250,000 jobs in the State of Maine and 50 million jobs nationwide.

A bipartisan group of us—Senator RUBIO, Senator CARDIN, Senator SHAHEEN, and I—put this bipartisan program together in March. We added funding in April, and we extended it in June until August 8.

The pandemic, unfortunately, is still forcing shutdowns and mitigation measures months later. Many of the small businesses that were sustained by their PPP loans are still unable to return to normal operations.

Without more assistance, without being eligible for a second PPP loan, many of the hardest hit small businesses, including our restaurants, our gift shops, our hotels, and our B&Bs, will be forced to close their doors, and, worse yet, lay off their workers. That is why it is so important that we reach bipartisan agreement quickly to provide further assistance to small businesses and nonprofits that have been kept alive by their first PPP loan, that have been able to retain and pay their employees but now are still struggling to survive due to this persistent pandemic.

The amendment that we are about to vote on would provide approximately \$258 billion in funding to allow eligibility for a second PPP loan for the hardest hit small businesses and nonprofits, while also expanding and improving the program in some common-sense ways.

This is all about keeping Americans employed. This amendment is endorsed by the NFIB, the National Restaurant Association, the American Hotel and Lodging Association, the International Franchise Association, HospitalityMaine, the United Fresh Produce Association, the National Fisheries Institute, and the International Foodservice Distributors Association.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this important step to renew and strengthen the PPP program to save our small businesses and their employees' jobs.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

#### PROTECT ACT—Motion to Proceed

The Senate proceeded to consider the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 554, S. 4675, a bill to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I withdraw the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 554, S. 4675.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The motion is withdrawn.

#### UIGHUR INTERVENTION AND GLOBAL HUMANITARIAN UNIFIED RESPONSE ACT OF 2019

The Senate proceeded to consider the House message to accompany S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 2652, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell Amendment No. 2680 (to Amendment No. 2652), to improve the small business programs.

#### MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to table amendment No. 2680 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Leg.]

#### YEAS—40

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Manchin	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Reed	

#### NAYS—57

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

#### NOT VOTING—3

Harris	Paul	Sinema
--------	------	--------

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### PROTECT ACT—Motion to Proceed

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 554, S. 4675, a bill to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to explain to the American people what is happening here on the floor of the Senate. After putting the Senate on pause for over 5 long months, while businesses closed, millions lost their jobs, and hundreds of thousands of Americans died, Leader MCCONNELL is now using this week to hold show votes on coronavirus relief. The vote we just had was not even a real vote. Leader MCCONNELL moved to table the bill, then voted against tabling it. It was a stunt, plain and simple. It goes to show how unserious the Republican process is here on the floor of the Senate. Democrats, by their vote, called it for what it is.

The truth is Leader MCCONNELL is doing these stunts on the floor because there is a hard-right faction in the Republican caucus that doesn't want to pass any bill—any other round of relief. The Republican leader admitted that as many as 20 Republican Senators don't want to vote for anything. One Republican Senator voted not to vote

for “another dime.” Every time the Republican White House asks the Republican Senators about a larger and needed COVID relief package, the Republican Senators say: Don’t do anything. We are too divided.

As if we needed any more proof this week that the votes this week are not serious, it was just reported in the Washington Post that Leader McCONNELL warned the White House against making a deal on a COVID relief bill before the election. Let me repeat that. According to a report in the Washington Post, the Republican leader warned the White House against making a deal on another stimulus bill before the election.

Maybe it is because he knows his caucus wouldn’t support it. Maybe it is because he doesn’t want anything to interfere with his true priority—rushing a Supreme Court Justice onto the bench mere days before a Presidential election. Maybe it is both. Whatever the reason, it is abundantly clear that what the Republican leader is offering this week is a stunt—designed to look real but designed to fail.

He told the White House he doesn’t actually want a deal before the election. Now, if my Republican colleagues—those of the mind to help the American people, not those who believe we have spent too much already—want to do something real, we are going to give them a chance on the floor right now. I will be making a motion to move the Senate into a posture by which we could all vote on the Heroes Act that passed the House. If the Senate were to pass it, it would head right to the President’s desk. The Democrats have already modified the bill to make it more palatable to our Republican colleagues by coming down over \$1 trillion.

So, if you are a Republican who wants to adequately fund our schools, our hospitals, and our medical centers, vote with the Democrats on the next motion. If you are a Republican who wants to adequately fund testing and tracing and devote the resources our country needs to prevent a second wave of the virus, you should vote with the Democrats on the next motion. If you are a Republican who wants to assist all small businesses, including our hardest hit industries and underserved communities, newspapers, restaurants, minority-owned businesses, and independent music venues and theaters, you can vote with us on the next motion. If you are a Republican who wants to employ a lifeline to the unemployed, to feed the hungry, to assist renters and homeowners, and to stave off drastic cuts to State and local services, you should vote with us—with the Democrats—on the next motion.

The country is crying out for real, substantial, comprehensive relief. The Heroes Act provides it. It includes all of the urgent and necessary measures that the Republicans have left out of their proposals. If my Republican colleagues are serious—really serious—

about providing relief to the American people, then, vote to allow the Senate to consider the Heroes Act.

#### VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. President, I move to table the McConnell motion to proceed to Calendar No. 554, S. 4675, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 52, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 204 Leg.]

##### YEAS—45

Baldwin  
Bennet  
Blumenthal  
Booker  
Brown  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carper  
Casey  
Coons  
Cortez Masto  
Duckworth  
Durbin  
Feinstein  
Gillibrand

Hassan  
Heinrich  
Hirono  
Jones  
Kaine  
King  
Klobuchar  
Leahy  
Manchin  
Markey  
Menendez  
Merkley  
Murphy  
Murray  
Peters

Reed  
Rosen  
Sanders  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Shaheen  
Smith  
Stabenow  
Tester  
Udall  
Van Hollen  
Warner  
Warren  
Whitehouse  
Wyden

##### NAYS—52

Alexander  
Barrasso  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boozman  
Braun  
Burr  
Capito  
Cassidy  
Collins  
Cornyn  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Daines  
Enzi  
Ernst

Fischer  
Gardner  
Graham  
Grassley  
Hawley  
Hoeven  
Hyde-Smith  
Inhofe  
Johnson  
Kennedy  
Lankford  
Lee  
Loeffler  
McConnell  
McSally  
Moran  
Murkowski  
Perdue

Portman  
Risch  
Roberts  
Romney  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Sasse  
Scott (FL)  
Scott (SC)  
Shelby  
Sullivan  
Thune  
Tillis  
Toomey  
Wicker  
Young

##### NOT VOTING—3

Harris Paul Sinema

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Motion to Proceed

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 866.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. Sinema) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 43, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 205 Leg.]

##### YEAS—52

Alexander  
Barrasso  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boozman  
Braun  
Burr  
Capito  
Cassidy  
Collins  
Cornyn  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Daines  
Enzi  
Ernst

Fischer  
Gardner  
Graham  
Grassley  
Hawley  
Hoeven  
Hyde-Smith  
Inhofe  
Johnson  
Kennedy  
Lankford  
Lee  
Loeffler  
McConnell  
McSally  
Moran  
Murkowski  
Perdue

Portman  
Risch  
Roberts  
Romney  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Sasse  
Scott (FL)  
Scott (SC)  
Shelby  
Sullivan  
Thune  
Tillis  
Toomey  
Wicker  
Young

##### NAYS—43

Baldwin  
Bennet  
Blumenthal  
Booker  
Brown  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carper  
Casey  
Coons  
Cortez Masto  
Duckworth  
Durbin  
Feinstein  
Gillibrand

Hassan  
Heinrich  
Hirono  
Kaine  
King  
Klobuchar  
Leahy  
Manchin  
Markey  
Menendez  
Merkley  
Murphy  
Murray  
Peters  
Reed

Rosen  
Sanders  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Smith  
Stabenow  
Tester  
Udall  
Van Hollen  
Warner  
Warren  
Whitehouse  
Wyden

##### NOT VOTING—5

Harris Paul Sinema  
Jones Shaheen

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

##### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

##### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Michael Jay Newman, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, Mike Crapo, Marsha Blackburn, Tim Scott, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Thune, Todd Young, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, because of this illicit process, this rush to judgment, and the worst nomination proceeding of the Supreme Court in American history that has so defiled the Senate, I move to adjourn and to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, at 12 noon on the following dates and that, following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, October 23; Tuesday, October 27; Friday, October 30; Tuesday, November 3; and Friday, November 6; further, that if there is an agreement on legislation in relation to the COVID pandemic, the Senate may convene under the authority of S. Res. 296 of the 108th Congress; finally, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, November 6, it convene at 4:30 p.m., Monday, November 9, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion would require consent and is not in order.

#### MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. SCHUMER. I appeal the ruling of the Chair, and I move to table the appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to table the appeal.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Ex.]

#### YEAS—52

Alexander	Blackburn	Boozman
Barrasso	Blunt	Braun

Burr	Hawley
Capito	Hoeven
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith
Collins	Inhofe
Cornyn	Johnson
Cotton	Kennedy
Cramer	Lankford
Crapo	Lee
Cruz	Loeffler
Daines	McConnell
Enzi	McSally
Ernst	Moran
Fischer	Murkowski
Gardner	Perdue
Graham	Portman
Grassley	Risch

Roberts
Romney
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Wicker
Young

#### NAYS—43

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

#### NOT VOTING—5

Harris	Shaheen	Stabenow
Paul	Sinema	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table was agreed to, and the decision of the Chair stands.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for such time as I shall consume.

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

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, in July, the Senate passed the fiscal year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act, with 86 Senators from both sides of the aisle voting in support of it.

I am glad that we have such a strong vote because I believe—and I have always believed—it is the most important vote, most important bill that we do all year. The NDAA, as we call it—that stands for National Defense Authorization Act—is how Congress provides the policy and resources for our national defense for the ensuing year, and it always passes by a bipartisan bill. And it has now for 60 years in a row. Well, not quite 60. It is 59 years. It will be 60 when this bill is concluded.

There is not much we do around here anymore on a bipartisan basis for this long, but the NDAA is special. Here is why: Because each and every American benefits from the bill—each family, each community in each State. Oklahoma is no exception to this rule. What makes Oklahoma special is this. Just as much as this bill takes care of Oklahoma, Oklahoma takes care of the country by the very nature of those things, those functions that we perform each year, militarily.

As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have already been down here a lot talking about the NDAA and how this bill protects all Americans, how it cares for our military families, and how it gives our military the resources needed to defend this Nation.

Confession is good for the soul. I have to admit, as chairman, I made certain that the NDAA did the maximum benefit possible for Oklahoma. I want to talk a little bit about what the NDAA does for Oklahoma and how what we do in Oklahoma makes the rest of the country more secure—because it does.

Oklahoma is home to some of the Department of Defense's most valuable installations and assets, and it has been this way for the better part of a century. It is also the epicenter of public-private collaboration, where industry partners and universities and others work in close coordination with our military.

The defense programs based in Oklahoma protect our military advantage, making sure that we stay ahead—or, I should say, even better and more accurately now, get ahead of our competitors, especially China and Russia. I think we all understand now China and Russia are the greatest threat facing this Nation. We allowed them to—I don't say this critically of the previous administration, but during the previous administration, a lot of our military actually suffered some 25 percent, in terms of appropriations, during the last 5 years. That would have been from fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2015, and so we, in some areas, are not ahead of China and Russia.

I have been around for a long time. I am a lot older than some of the other people in here, and I remember the administrations since World War II. I always prided ourselves in that we had the very best of everything. We learned the hard way in World War II that that would be necessary.

Oklahomans know the importance of these programs that we have in Oklahoma, not just to our economy but to our national security. Not all Americans may know, so here are a few examples. When our planes fly long distances, sometimes they need to refuel, of course, and this can be in midair. Right now, the KC-135 has been the refueler of choice now for 60 years. It has done a great job. It is one that has lasted and has worked hard since 1956.

I remember back during the last administration—the Obama administration—I am a conservative Republican, and I wasn't real fond of the previous administration, but there is one person I really liked, and that was Deborah Lee James. She was the Secretary of the Air Force in the previous administration. She and I worked hard with the idea that we were going to have to do something about the KC-135; it had been around 60 years.

I remember, I said, when we were at Altus Air Force Base—that was where we were going to be delivering—that is the first KC-46 to replace the 135. And I remember saying that 60 years ago two wonderful things happened: No. 1, my wife Kay and I got married. And No. 2, the first KC-135 was delivered to Altus Air Force Base. Where is the KC-135 training and the maintenance base? It is in Oklahoma.

It is time to update that aircraft. The KC-46 is the next-generation tanker, and Oklahoma is going to play a key role in this aircraft as well, thanks to the NDAA. All training for this new aircraft is conducted at Altus Air Force Base, in Altus, OK; and all depot maintenance will be performed at Tinker Air Force Base, in Oklahoma City; the same as the KC-135 maintenance has taken place for the last 60 years.

We will also conduct depot maintenance on the B-21 bomber at Tinker. The B-21, which is still in the development phase, is going to be vital to our Air Force. It will be a critical part of our deterrence posture: a strong military that lets our enemies know that they can't escape us.

This is cutting-edge technology, designed to replace a few types of bomber aircraft that have lived in Oklahoma for the last half century.

What this year's NDAA means is the Air Force will be guaranteeing Tinker's workload for the next 50 years and beyond. You know, I have talked a lot on the floor about the NDAA and about a lot of issues, not always just military but primarily. But I have never really talked much about what we in Oklahoma do and the great contribution we make. That is kind of what I am doing right now. The third kind of aircraft we have in Oklahoma are the planes that help our Air Force pilots become the best in the world. We are talking about our training aircraft.

Many of the pilots in our Air Force conduct their pilot training at Vance Air Force Base, using aircraft like the T-38. T-38—that plane has been around since 1962, and it is still being used right now as a trainer, but it has outlived its usefulness in terms of training for modern aircraft. We can have all the modern aircraft in the world, but if we are training with vehicles that are 50, 60 years old, it doesn't train them as well as they should be trained. We have had the T-38 around for that long period of time.

The T-7 is going to be that newest aircraft. In this year's NDAA—the National Defense Authorization Act—we ensure that we continue to progress on developing this new aircraft. That is the T-7. It will be flying in the skies over Oklahoma for at least probably the next six decades.

Right here, Oklahoma is home to aircraft that support three critical prongs of our national defense, making sure that we have the skills and the equipment and the reach needed to deter and defeat our adversaries for the foreseeable future. But the Air Force is not the only service with a large footprint in Oklahoma. The Army is also a rich part of our military heritage, and Oklahoma's military installations help support the Army's No. 1 modernization priority, which is long-range precision fires. That is the No. 1 priority of the U.S. Army right now.

These are munitions that will be able to reach across hundreds, if not thousands, of miles and strike targets. They

can be used on land; they can be used in the skies; and they can be used at sea and beyond. Unfortunately, this is an area where we have already fallen behind our competitors like China and Russia, but Oklahoma is going to help us catch up.

The Paladin Integrated Management System—it is called PIM—is a critical piece of this Army modernization effort, and it is based at Fort Sill, at our very own Fires Center of Excellence. It is assembled in Elgin, OK.

This is really important, especially when you know the history. We have been working to build a modern artillery system for decades. First, starting back in 1994, we were then working to build the Crusader. The Crusader was going to be our artillery system. That was going to be the best one around. We worked, and we invested money in it. The Crusader was going to be our new, modern system that would set us up above Russia and China. This was in 1994.

We spent \$2 billion on the Crusader. What happened to it? It was nixed, prematurely, in 2002 because it was over budget, and we thought the needs of warfare were changing. I never did believe that. I think that Crusader was a good vehicle and was what we needed for the next decades to come. But it was gone. And then some of the same mistakes were repeated in the Army's Future Combat Systems.

The Future Combat Systems—called the FCS—was cut in 2009, but it wasn't \$2 billion that we had spent on that before we cut it, it was \$20 billion. We actually used \$22 billion for an artillery system, and we still didn't have one. Billions and billions were wasted. That is how China and Russia got ahead of us—but not for long because we are catching up.

There are more than just DOD programs based in Oklahoma. Our countless industry partners work there as well and help us make sure our forces are on the cutting edge of innovation. The XQ-58A Valkyrie is an unmanned aerial system that does not need a runway to take off. It will accompany the next-generation aircraft, like the world-class F-35 on its missions. It will perform an escort function. It is one that takes off vertically, and it is one without a pilot.

This is one of the Air Force's top priorities. It is what they call a Vanguard Program. It is what the future of air superiority looks like, and it is assembled in—you guessed it—Oklahoma.

That is just one example of the amazing technologies we are building across the State, but it is not just our military installations and industries supporting America's national defense. In Oklahoma, we work well together across the State—military, industry, and even educational universities.

In Lawton, just outside of Fort Sill, we have something called FISTA, where we try to get all of these stakeholders together in one building. It is a private sector. I have to say this about

the private sector in Oklahoma. We have gone through five different efforts to change our military. And in each one of the five—these are called BRAC rounds. A BRAC round is the Base Realignment and Closure Commission—they meet and evaluate all of the military installations in the country, in America, and evaluate which ones should be expanded and which ones should be done away with and which ones should be reduced. I would say, in the State of Oklahoma, we have five major military installations, and we are the only State that has increased with each one of the five BRAC rounds since 1987.

You might say that is political influence. It is not. It is community support. That is what we have always done. For example, even in our universities, the University of Oklahoma is working on research that will accelerate the work of the Long-Range Precision Fires Air Missile Defense Cross-Functional Team at Fort Sill—top modernization priorities for the Army. The FISTA is just one piece of this research and innovation done in Oklahoma. It is really happening all around the State. Oklahoma State University is also conducting critical research on drones, unmanned systems, where our military has growing needs. We are leaders in Oklahoma. This will support operations where traditional methods are not sufficient for takeoffs and landings and ensure our military can penetrate any environment. We have made sure that we have committed funding especially for this kind of research, and Oklahoma State University is the perfect candidate because of the successful work it has already done on these systems. We are ahead of others.

Also, Tulsa University has been designated by the National Security Agency as a cyber center of academic excellence. This year, in the NDAA that we will be passing, which is probably going to be in the later part of November, it directs the Army Corps of Engineers to form a partnership with an academic institution like Tulsa University to conduct critical cyber research that will support our national security. TU has a track record of success. It is certainly a go-to for just this type of research, and I anticipate that this is exactly what is going to happen.

Our universities really are second to none in terms of this research, and their hard work and ingenuity are going to help us catch up to China and Russia and ensure our military superiority will be there for years to come.

With the massive amount of work lined up for the State of Oklahoma, I knew our bill had to help communities across the State provide the number of workers that will be needed. One provision we included to address this allows for the appointment of recently retired members of the armed services—armed services members who have retired—to assume DOD positions at certain pay grades without their having to wait the requisite lengths of time. This ensures

more people will stay in Oklahoma. Skilled workers won't need to leave the State to find work. These are the people who know the programs best. It is what they have spent their careers doing, and they are going to be able to continue working on them even after they have transitioned out of Active Duty.

This is all in this Defense authorization bill that we have under consideration today that we are going to pass. Our work ethic is just one of the trademarks of the Oklahomans I am lucky to represent.

Another is what we call the Oklahoma standard. Oklahomans know how important it is to care for and support each other, especially our military families. Our military families don't have it easy. The nature of the job means frequent moves around the country and around the world. This means they make a lot of sacrifices. We can't ask military spouses to sacrifice as well. So what we have done is, actually, what we started in last year's Defense authorization bill. At that time, we put in a program to help spouses and families circumvent some of the time they waste but that they have to have when they move into new occupations. We have now done the same thing, but this was in last year's bill.

One way we did it was by extending the DOD program to reimburse spouses for the costs of new professional licenses and credentials. This year, we have improved on that. We have made it easier to transfer those licenses across State lines, but you can't do that until after this bill has passed. We know that, when we improve family readiness, we improve overall military readiness.

I have to say that there are a lot of people around here who don't think we need as strong a military as we need. They talk about it, and I have heard the statement. I have heard it a hundred times. They say we spend more on our military than China and Russia do put together. Well, there is a reason for that. In our military, we look after the troops, after the individuals. You know about the housing problems that we have had, and we have spent a lot of money to correct that problem. We are doing this at the current time. We also have schools for the kids of our troops and educational facilities. Now, in Russia and China—Communist countries—they give them guns and say: Go out and shoot people. That is it.

The last thing I want to point out about this year's NDAA is also the readiness issue. This year, we made sure that we would not have a BRAC round. I mentioned a minute ago that a BRAC round is a Base Realignment and Closure Commission, and we are not going to have one. Now is not the time to reduce our military footprint any further, not when we face so many threats around the world and not when we have worked so hard with President Trump to rebuild and repair our readi-

ness. It is easy to see how these provisions we fought so hard to include in this bill will help Oklahomans and, really, all Americans.

That is why I think the NDAA is the most important bill of the year, not only for Oklahoma but for the rest of the Nation as well. Serving as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and representing Oklahomans are the two things I am most proud of. I am proud that we can do right by our Armed Forces and Oklahomans with this year's NDAA.

The next step is to make this bill law, and the next step is going to take place when our colleagues from the House have a conference report. I think most people know that, with a bill like this, the Senate passes a bill, and the House passes a bill. Then there is a conference report, and they have to get together and have a conference. It is not going to be easy because there are a lot of differences to iron out.

For those who want to know when it is going to happen, as for the conference report, the House is not going to appoint its conferees until November 16, so it is going to be a while. It doesn't matter. The deadline is actually December 31, and that will happen. It has happened for 60 years in a row, and it is going to happen this time. No matter what, we are going to get it done. We have for the last 59 years, and we are going to do it again.

I was talking to people at Tinker Air Force Base today, and they were talking about the things that they are needing to do. Tinker Air Force Base has turned into probably—I believe it is—the largest military complex in the country. People are doing incredible work there. I was talking to the whole team, and those on the team were talking about what they are preparing for in the next year. I can assure you it is all going to be good and that Oklahoma is going to fare well. We are going to fare well in our equipment and in our training. I am proud of Oklahoma's contribution to the safety of America, and we are doing a good job in Oklahoma.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I had the chance to hear Chairman INHOFE's remarks. I speak for many of us when I offer my appreciation for his chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee, for his commitment to our troops, and, in my case, particularly, for the great way he works with my senior Senator, JACK REED, who is the ranking member on that committee, in order to get all of this work done. While he may have bragging rights over airbases in Oklahoma, Rhode Island has bragging rights on submarine construction, and it is very important to us. So I offer my appreciation to the chairman for all of his support for the submarine program that has meant so much to our Nation's security and to Rhode Island.

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

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I want to start tonight by just making a few remarks regarding what is ahead of us in the next few days, and that is the debate about a Supreme Court Justice. I won't be able to cover everything tonight that I want to cover, but I will just make some preliminary comments about healthcare, which has been the driving debate in this nomination or at least the issue that has dominated the debate so far.

We made, in my judgment, great progress in 2010, when the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was passed. Some refer to that statute as ObamaCare, which isn't really the name of the statute and doesn't adequately describe what it is about. The patient protection part of the act—or the name of the statute—is the part that I think involves most Americans, all the coverages that are provided, all the protections, I should say, that are provided. One example of that, of course, is the protection for preexisting conditions. The state of the law prior to that was if an insurance company did not want to cover someone because of a preexisting condition, they had the authority to do that or they could cover the person but charge them more. That is no longer permitted, and in a State like Pennsylvania, that number—the number of people who are protected by that provision of the law because they have a preexisting condition—that number is 5.5 million people. Nationally, it is as high as 135 million. So we know what is at stake in the debate, and it just so happens in this context that it is part of the debate about the Supreme Court nominee, Judge Barrett.

I have a threshold, initial concern that is even before we get to the debate about the Affordable Care Act and what might happen to it by virtue of the lawsuit filed that is now before the Court with an argument date of November 10. I think that is the primary reason for the rush of her nomination—so that she can be a member of the Court for that argument on November 10 and make that decision, which I think is highly likely to be a decision against upholding the constitutionality of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The threshold concern I have, though, is just the way this process has unfolded, not just more recently but over time. The President, when he was a candidate, said he would choose from a list that was developed basically by



two groups: the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation. They came up with a list, and that is the list he said he would choose from. That list was expanded when he became President.

Judge Barrett was on that list, Justice Kavanaugh, Justice Gorsuch—you can see the pattern there. I don't want a Supreme Court that is chosen by those two groups, but, so far, that is what the President has decided to do.

In this case, the rush is, I think, for that basic reason, that the majority party here and Republicans in the House and a Republican President want this statute struck down. They want to have that majority, a six-to-three majority, to do that.

But I guess, as much as I can talk, as we all do, about some of the policy—and I will—and the numbers, I think the most compelling parts of this debate are the stories that come from people across Pennsylvania and across the country who have come to us. I met some of these families about 10 years ago when we were debating the act then. I met them again when we were trying to stop the repeal in 2017 and 2018, and now we are getting together again because of this new and, I think, mortal threat to the law.

I will just mention two for tonight—Erin and Shannon. Erin, I know better; I have met her over the years—Erin Gabriel. She has been very public about the fight that she is waging on behalf of her three children with disabilities: Collin, Bridget, and Abby. I have heard a good bit about each of them and maybe the most about Abby.

Erin is from Beaver County, PA, right on the Ohio border, just north of Pittsburgh, and she is very concerned about what happens to her children because of their disabilities. Of course, under the old law—the old way of approaching these issues—a child with a disability could be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition, and, also, a corresponding or related concern is the threat to Medicaid itself, especially in budget debates here over time, and Medicaid expansion.

Erin Gabriel is one of the people who has made very clear to us the adverse impact on the life of her children that could result if the statute is overturned and declared unconstitutional.

A second person who has brought her story to our attention is Shannon Striner. Shannon is a mom to two daughters: Haley and Sienna. Haley is actually a second grader now, and Sienna is a young girl with Down syndrome. Obviously, Sienna is a child who is going to need a lot of care, and we have to make sure that our healthcare system is there to meet the needs of those families.

We are going to be talking more about these challenges that these families face, but for the life of me, I will never be able to understand—if I lived 1,000 years, I will never be able to understand why we would ever go backward on healthcare. Why would we go

back to a time when a child or an adult who has a preexisting condition would be denied coverage? Why would we go back and erase by virtue of, in this case, what would be a judicial fiat all the progress that has been made because of the Affordable Care Act?

So many more people have the security of healthcare. In my home State, it is 1 million people who gained coverage. The number now nationally is about 23 million. That number keeps going up. Most of them are getting their healthcare through the expansion of Medicaid. The number on that keeps growing.

Part of the reason it is growing is because people lost their insurance as a result of the adverse impact of COVID-19—people losing their jobs and turning to programs like Medicaid for coverage. So that number keeps going up.

In the State of Pennsylvania, just by way of example, the latest number is 840,781 Pennsylvanians who have benefited from Medicaid expansion. The benefit of it is one of the reasons you have States that are not controlled by Democrats that are voting to expand coverage. So that number keeps going up.

I want to make sure that we take every step necessary to protect coverage, not just to uphold a statute and to, frankly, grow the number of people with healthcare but to remember the impact it has on people's lives and ensure that the people who gain coverage don't lose it.

We have a State—as the Presiding Officer knows because of his family's roots—we have a State of a few big cities, but mostly it is a State of a lot of small towns. We have 48 rural counties out of 67, and in those small towns or rural communities, we have a lot of people who have gained coverage because of the expansion of Medicaid.

As I said, you can see the number: 840,000 out of about 1 million who gained coverage—gained coverage through Medicaid expansion, so that is a big number. And even in a small county like Cameron County, one of our smallest—it might be the smallest county in population—there are 350 people in that county who got Medicaid expansion. I want to make sure all 350 or more can benefit from Medicaid expansion.

Big cities like Philadelphia have bigger numbers, obviously. When I look at my home county, Lackawanna County, and look at the next county next to it, the largest population county in the region, Luzerne County, these are huge numbers of people who have gained coverage on Medicaid expansion. In Lackawanna, it is more than 17,180 people and more than 26,000 in Luzerne County. Now, that is not accounting for the folks who got coverage because of the exchanges that were set up. So the balance of those folks in Pennsylvania who got coverage, between 840 and 1 million, got their coverage because of the exchanges that were set up by the Affordable Care Act.

One last point before I move to a second topic: Here are some of the benefits of Medicaid expansion that don't get a lot of attention but should warrant attention. I will just give you one example in 1 year from one State.

In 2019, in Pennsylvania, over 135,000 people were able to receive treatment for substance use disorder because they were covered through Medicaid expansion. Now, most people may not think of that longer category or that long phrase, “substance use disorder,” but a subcategory to that and one of the largest parts of that challenge for many families and many communities is the opioid crisis. So that means tens of thousands of Pennsylvanians were getting covered by Medicaid expansion and treatment therefrom just at the time the opioid crisis was on the rise and causing death and devastation to so many families and so many communities. So that is one benefit to the program that doesn't get a lot of attention.

We know that on the larger question of the Affordable Care Act itself, beyond Medicaid expansion and the exchanges, is the so-called prescription drug doughnut hole, that coverage gap where the older Pennsylvanian, at some point in the availability of prescription medications, has to pay for a while before they get into a catastrophic category where the Federal Government and the Medicare Program can pick up the cost. But in that coverage gap—and “doughnut hole” is a very benign way of describing a very burdensome problem for a lot of seniors—if that were to go away, if the Affordable Care Act were declared unconstitutional and that doughnut hole coverage or the filling of the gap, so to speak, were not there the next year or the year after or 5 years or 10 years from now, that could adversely impact hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians. By one estimate, more than 293,000 people on Medicare would be forced to pay more for their prescription drugs.

So that is a lot on the line when it comes to the Affordable Care Act, and that is why this nomination is of such great consequence for one big issue. I think the Affordable Care Act Supreme Court decision will be the most significant decision that this Court will decide maybe for 25 years because of the scope of the impact.

Even someone who is not threatened directly by the loss of coverage, the loss of protection for a preexisting condition, or even someone who can buy because of their wealth or their circumstances—that person will also be affected because premiums will likely skyrocket. So there are very few, if any, Americans not affected by this lawsuit that will utterly destroy the Affordable Care Act.

RUSSIA

Mr. President, I want to move to another urgent issue, and this arose again just the other night. This is a matter of significant foreign policy that I

know Members on both sides are concerned about: President Trump's continued affinity for Vladimir Putin, most recently evidenced by his silence regarding the recent poisoning of Russian opposition leader Alexei Navalny, who gave an interview on CBS's "60 Minutes" that aired just 2 nights ago, October 18, this past Sunday. Navalny was poisoned and nearly killed by a highly lethal chemical weapon nerve agent, Novichok, in August of this year and is currently recovering in Berlin under close security protection.

In the interview on "60 Minutes," Navalny directly alleged that Vladimir Putin was behind the poisoning. I am quoting him now. When asked a question, "Do you think Vladimir Putin was responsible?" Navalny said, "I don't think. I am sure he is responsible."

While German Chancellor Angela Merkel and French President Macron have called for answers from Putin and led the European Union in imposing sanctions on Russian officials over the use of chemical weapons in violation of international law, President Trump's silence is, to use an old expression, deafening.

In a "60 Minutes" interview, Mr. Navalny goes on to describe that nerve agent, Novichok, is impossible to acquire. Only someone in Putin's position would be able to deploy it. As the world knows, Mr. Putin is not afraid to go after opponents, like Navalny, who continue to reveal the corruption and authoritarianism of his regime.

Despite the growing consensus that Putin himself may have directed the attack, our President has refused to even query—even ask questions—whether there is malicious intent involved. Vladimir Putin, as we know, is a proven enemy of democracy and will go to any lengths to undermine democracy activists in his own country and other countries.

When a President of the United States speaks out, the world listens. In this case—this case of attempted murder—the silence of President Trump is insulting to our values as Americans. He is signaling to autocratic leaders all over the world that it is OK to take direct action against their opposition through violence and intimidation. He is signaling to the world that the United States is not committed—not committed—to protecting and promoting democracy.

President Trump's silence on Alexei Navalny's poisoning is not the only instance of absolute deference to Vladimir Putin. Throughout his Presidency, President Trump has continuously made decisions that benefit Putin's agenda. In so doing, President Trump also acts to undermine U.S. influence and even to undermine our national security.

The U.S. Senate, as a part of a co-equal branch of government, must recognize this threat and act as a body to ensure that our institutions at home and our interests abroad are protected.

In these last 4 years, the Senate has not lived up to this solemn responsibility.

Here is a list—some may argue a short list—of how the President has enabled and empowered Putin and his efforts to undermine our democracy and our national security:

No. 1, vowing to pursue closer ties with Russia in his first foreign policy speech as a Presidential candidate at the Center for the National Interest in April of 2016, then-Candidate Trump said: "We desire to live peacefully and in friendship with Russia."

Openly and repeatedly questioning U.S. intelligence community findings that Russia interfered in the 2016 elections.

Siding with Putin—with Putin—at the 2018 Helsinki summit against the U.S. intelligence community findings about the 2016 election interference. At that now infamous press conference, President Trump said he doesn't "see any reason why" Russia would be responsible and that "President Putin was extremely strong and powerful in his denial today." That is what the President of the United States of America said, totally undermining our intelligence community in just a few remarks. In my judgment, this was one of the worst moments in the history of the U.S. Presidency—a dangerous statement by the President that undermined and still undermines our national security.

Another example is attempting to impeach Special Counsel Mueller's investigation into the Trump campaign's ties to Russia and Russian interference in the 2016 election. Special Counsel Mueller's report documents 10 episodes in which the President interfered with the investigation, including when he asked White House Counsel Don McGahn to fire Mueller in June of 2016. In my opinion, that is a clear case among several of such instances of obstruction of justice.

Next, deploying Attorney General Bill Barr around the world chasing conspiracy theories and investigating President Trump's complaints about the origin of the government's investigation into Russia's election interference.

Intimidating Ukraine's President to investigate former Vice President Biden and his son and threatening to cut U.S. security assistance to Ukraine if they didn't cooperate. As we all know, this originated in a White House whistleblower complaint that led to the President's impeachment. The President's conduct distracted from actual engagement and support to Ukraine as it continues to grapple with Russian aggression.

Next, making continued attacks against and undermining NATO, more recently evidenced by his sudden decision to withdraw nearly 10,000 U.S. troops from Germany.

Another example is withdrawing U.S. troops from Syria nearly a year ago, clearing the way for Russia—Russia—

to become the sole power broker in Syria through enhanced cooperation with Turkey, as evidenced by Turkey's purchase of the Russian S-400 missile system. The Associated Press reports of Russia deploying troops to Syria the same week that the United States withdrew indicates the benefit to Russia.

Next, failing to act on intelligence that the Russian Government offered to pay Taliban and Haqqani Network militants to target American troops in Afghanistan, as reported by the New York Times in June of this year. In fact, President Trump suggested this intelligence was "a hoax" in a July 1 tweet. It was not a hoax. We know it happened.

Withdrawing from the Open Skies Treaty, which gives us critical access to and intelligence into Russian military activities.

As I noted earlier, continuing to be silent—totally silent—about the recent poisoning of Russian opposition politician Alexei Navalny. Navalny has openly stated that Putin is behind the attack, as I mentioned, and President Trump stands apart—far apart—from Western leaders in his lack of condemnation of the attack.

Next, refusing to approve a clean 5-year extension of the New START treaty and thereby clearing a path for Russia to expand its nuclear arsenal unchecked.

Finally and most recently—just this statement alone maybe sums up all of it—the President said at a campaign rally on Monday, September 21:

I like Putin. He likes me.

This list should concern every Member of the Senate. I know it concerns a lot of the Members here, but we have to do more.

President Trump has never said a critical word about Vladimir Putin. Yet President Trump has publicly insulted, denigrated, and smeared the U.S. intelligence community, Members of Congress, and even veterans. His tweets disparaging Americans count in the hundreds—hundreds of tweets regarding Americans, but he has never said a word—not a single word—critical of Vladimir Putin.

I will focus on one of the big issues and then conclude. In June of this year, the New York Times reported on intelligence that the Russian Government offered to pay Taliban and Haqqani Network militants to target American troops in Afghanistan. The President's silence and refusal to raise this with Putin in his many one-on-one conversations with him is alarming, and this failure undermines our national security.

One incident that may have been a bounty attack was an April 2019 bombing that killed three marines. One of them was a Pennsylvanian. We know that as of the most recent numbers, 294 servicemembers from Pennsylvania were killed in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq—the third highest toll of any State.

Any possibility that Russia is playing a hand in killing American and Pennsylvania soldiers must be thoroughly investigated. President Trump's silence indicates not only that he doesn't care about Russian threats to national security, but apparently he doesn't care that American lives might be at risk because of Russian aggression. To date, the majority in the Senate has not taken appropriate action to hold this President accountable for his failure to act or investigate these serious allegations.

#### ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. President, despite these recent failures abroad, one of the biggest challenges we all face right now is the pressing threat to our democracy.

As Americans across the Nation are currently casting their ballots by way of voting early in person or voting by mail for the next President of the United States, we are seeing increasing reports of Russian efforts to interfere in our election.

The CIA has concluded that Vladimir Putin is likely directly involved in Russian efforts to promote disinformation, sow discord, and carry out cyber attacks on the United States. I cite for this the New York Times September 22, 2020, article.

Former Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, a former Republican Senator here from Indiana on two different occasions—he served his State twice in that capacity—wrote in an op-ed recently:

If we fail to take every conceivable effort to ensure the integrity of our election, the winners will not be Donald Trump or Joe Biden, Republicans or Democrats. The only winners will be Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping and Ali Khamenei.

Leaders, of course, of China and Iran. Despite clear evidence, President Trump continues to deny Russian misconduct, and he continues to contradict our intelligence community.

We should ask, what is the obligation of the Senate? I spent 4 years—as many people have—urging the President from afar, at least, to actively demonstrate to us that his love of country outweighs his affinity for Putin. At this point in time, I don't expect his behavior to change. But it is incumbent—in-cumbent—upon the U.S. Senate, as part of a coequal branch of government, to call out the President and to hold him accountable when he engages in these kinds of actions or inactions, as the case may be.

The Senate has taken some actions. This body has passed a number of substantive sanctions: the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act—so-called CAATSA—against Russia for its aggression in Ukraine and interference in the 2016 election. That was the right thing to do and an appropriate thing to do.

The Senate Intelligence Committee and other committees of jurisdiction have done important work documenting Russia's interference in the 2016 election, but that is not enough.

The work cannot stop there. Russia has continued, will continue, and will continue to succeed in undermining our national security if we allow them.

The silence of Senate Republicans on this issue of the President's total deference to Putin has become, in my judgment, complicity. Those who fail to stand up and loudly express their alarm are tacitly showing their approval. Their failure to take action is also its own danger to our democracy.

Instead of prioritizing the unprecedented public health and economic crisis that is in front of us, some Republican-led committees—not all but some—are prioritizing a partisan political investigation, the basis for which stems directly from a known Russian disinformation campaign.

In the face of intelligence reports showing that the Russians are once again seeking to influence this election, Senate Republicans have refused to pass a single piece of substantive election security legislation.

There is still time. I will give one example or one suggestion to the majority. The SAFE Act, which requires paper ballots in Federal elections and would authorize \$775 million in grants to help States secure their voting systems, passed the House 450 days ago, but Majority Leader McCONNELL would rather let this bill gather dust on his desk than take meaningful action to protect our democracy, to protect our election. The unwillingness to protect our elections from foreign interference is a dereliction of duty by the majority.

Finally, in conclusion, I call on my colleagues to answer the call of duty to protect our election, protect our democracy, and protect our national security against malign and persistent Russian influence and interference orchestrated by the man President Trump has never criticized.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

#### REMEMBERING AMBASSADOR RICHARD SCHIFTER

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I mourn the loss of a tremendous champion for human rights and the State of Israel and one of my personal heroes and mentors, Ambassador Richard Schifter. Ambassador Schifter lived a truly remarkable life. After escaping Nazi-occupied Austria in 1938, he bravely returned to Europe just a few short years later as one of the U.S. Army's "Ritchie Boys", German-speaking officers trained in counterintelligence at Camp Ritchie in Maryland. While serving in Europe, he learned that all of his family had been killed in the Holocaust. At just over 20 years old, Ambassador Schifter had experienced more adversity than most of us see in a lifetime. Nevertheless, he spent the next seven decades demonstrating incredible

faith and courage as he strived to make the world a better place.

Ambassador Schifter was successful in this mission. After he graduated from Yale Law School, he went on to become an attorney, advocating for the rights of Native American Tribes facing discrimination at the hands of the U.S. Government. Under Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush, he served as Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, U.S. Representative to the Geneva-based UN Human Rights Commission, and as Deputy U.S. Representative to the UN Security Council. Under President Clinton, he served as Special Assistant to the President on the staff of the National Security Council and as Special Advisor to the Secretary of State. As a diplomat and public servant, he fought against oppressive regimes around the world. He pressured the Soviet Union to release political prisoners, end the criminalization of dissent, and allow the emigration of Soviet Jews. After leaving the U.S. Government, Ambassador Schifter went on the lead the American Jewish International Relations Institute, where he fiercely defended the State of Israel and worked to ensure that other people would never suffer his family's fate under the Nazis. Until his last day, Ambassador Schifter fought to promote fairness and democracy and to protect the security and freedom of others.

I would be remiss if I failed to commemorate Ambassador Schifter's enormous impact on our home State of Maryland. Ambassador Schifter served for 20 years on the Maryland State Board of Education, leading both the Governor's Commission on Funding the Education of Handicapped Children and the Governor's Commission on Values Education. He was also the chairman of the Montgomery County Democratic Committee. In all these roles, he worked to expand equality and opportunity for everyone in our State. Even as his professional responsibilities spanned the globe, Ambassador Schifter remained committed to building a brighter future for his neighbors.

Ambassador Schifter's passing is a staggering loss, but his legacy lives on and will serve as the true North Star for all of us who share his devotion to human rights, democracy, and decency. His parent's decision in 1938 to send their 15-year-old son to a new country, alone, saved not just his life, but also countless others on whose behalf Ambassador Schifter worked so indefatigably throughout his illustrious career. I extend my deepest condolences Ambassador Schifter's children and grandchildren and all those who were fortunate enough to call Ambassador Schifter a friend.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## RECOGNIZING THE CURTIS FAMILY

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize Dawn Curtis and her late husband Danny Curtis on being named 2020 Angels in Adoption award recipients.

The Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute, CCAI, was established in 2001 to raise awareness about the need for adoption in the United States and eliminate barriers standing between orphan and foster children becoming part of a family. Angels in Adoption is the CCAI's signature public awareness program, which annually recognizes outstanding individuals, families, and organizations that have made extraordinary contributions to adoption, permanency, and child welfare. I am honored to congratulate Dawn and Danny Curtis for their exemplary work that led to this well-deserved national honor.

Dawn and Danny had two biological children and dreamed of a bigger family. The call to expand their family was answered during a visit to their local Walmart, where Dawn and Danny were browsing a photo album of children in foster care at a booth hosted by the Arkansas Department of Human Services. They fell in love with the picture of a 4-year-old girl and learned she had three brothers. The siblings had been in the foster care system for 3 years and multiple homes when the couple adopted all four of the children.

After their first adoption experience, Dawn decided to follow her passion to work with children in foster care and obtained her master's degree in social work. She went on to work for the Arkansas Department of Human Services and served in a variety of roles during her career, including as an adoption specialist. During these years, the family was approached to consider adopting others in foster care and eventually added six more children to their home.

Danny worked for many years as a police officer and a bus driver while caring for his growing family. Danny and Dawn also visited Washington, DC, on several occasions to advocate for adoption and children in foster care. The 12 Curtis children span 20 years of age and are all adults now, but the example and dedication of their parents continues to move everyone around them.

The Curtis family is an amazing example of putting love into action. Their personal commitment changed the lives of the children they brought into their family and serves as an inspiration for others as to the impact of foster care and adoption.●

## REMEMBERING NORMAN HARRY

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I come forward today to recognize the life and service of Norman Harry, wise leader of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, fierce advocate for the environ-

ment and a friend to all Nevadans. On the morning of August 11, 2020, Mr. Harry passed peacefully at his home in Nixon, NV, his family surrounding him in love. He was 65 years old.

Mr. Harry was born to Floyd and Charlotte Harry on October 20, 1954, and was raised on the Pyramid Lake Paiute Reservation in addition to spending time with family on the Walker River Paiute Reservation. At Fernley High School, he played basketball and was a member of the rodeo club, going on to gain recognition as a competitive team roper and talented rodeo photographer as a young man.

On December 21, 1990, he married Beverly, and together, they have a son, Jared, and a daughter, Autumn. He was dedicated to his family and to his people and was recognized as a national leader in the environmental justice movement as he was a tireless advocate for his people, the lands, the water, and the bounty our natural world provides.

Mr. Harry's legacy includes his historic work protecting Northern Nevada's Pyramid Lake. Under his leadership, the Truckee River Operating Agreement was completed and settled decades of litigation over water rights and preserving the flow of water to Pyramid Lake and securing it for future generations.

Over the years, Mr. Harry served in many roles for the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, including as Tribal chair for three terms and vice chair. He fought many battles to protect water quality in northern Nevada and waged a multiyear battle that ended the open burning of munitions at the Sierra Army Depot in Herlong, CA, a practice that sent toxic clouds eastward over the nearby Pyramid Lake Paiute tribal lands and northern Nevada. In 2005, he fought for the removal of 13 tons of rockets, shells, and ammunition from Pyramid Lake left by the military going back to World War II. He served as chairman of the board for Great Basin Mine Watch and, through his life, urged other Tribal leaders to get involved in protecting groundwater and environmental resources for the people. He mentored and taught countless other activists and organizers to champion issues of environmental protection.

Today, I celebrate the life and many contributions of Mr. Norman Harry, and I offer my sincere condolences to his family and Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe. The State of Nevada is a better place because we were lucky enough to call Norman Harry one of our own. His activism, leadership, knowledge, and voice will be sorely missed.●

## RECOGNIZING RANDY DRUVENGA

• Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I am honored to congratulate Waverly's Randy Druvenga on the conclusion of his tenure as Chair of the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies—NAMIC—a member organization

of property and casualty insurance companies. Randy has helped lead this organization through its 125th year of existence, including the NAMIC Mutual Insurance Foundation's drive to raise \$125,000 for scholarships to help talented young Americans pursue their college degrees toward careers in insurance. It is fitting that Randy led NAMIC during this milestone anniversary as the association was founded by Iowans in 1895.

While the Hawkeye State is happy to share Randy with NAMIC, we are most proud of his servant leadership in his home State. Randy has served as the past president of the Mutual Insurance Association of Iowa and is currently president of First Maxfield Mutual Insurance Association, a farm mutual insurance company serving more than 7,900 policyholders in northeast Iowa. He is a constant presence in his community, supporting numerous causes including the Waverly-Shell Rock Community Schools Foundation, and as a former referee and member of the Iowa High School Athletic Association Officials Hall of Fame.

I want to again congratulate Randy Druvenga for his leadership. Iowans are famous for their commitment to their communities, and Randy embodies that spirit at home and beyond.●

## REMEMBERING MIRIAM STAHL

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I would like to honor the life of a woman who made immense contributions to improve the lives of children throughout New Hampshire, Miriam Stahl.

Originally from the Midwest, Miriam moved to New Hampshire to be near her family, and once here, she began working at a critical community resource and early intervention center called the Richie McFarland Children's Center.

Founded in 1971, the Richie McFarland Children's Center works to provide social and therapeutic programs for children, including those who experience disabilities. This center helps children learn, grow, and thrive, while also empowering families and working to meet the needs of every child. The center and its remarkable staff are often the first professional resources made available to a family and child grappling with developmental challenges. To say that the center serves as a lifeline is an understatement.

According to her colleagues, the Richie McFarland Children's Center would not be what it is today without Miriam's vision and leadership. Miriam served as the executive director of the center for a decade, and she believed passionately in the power of early intervention to help children develop.

During her tenure, Miriam did all that she could to use her talent, energy, and quiet determination to prioritize the needs of children and to provide them with vital support. Her advocacy was clear, no nonsense, and nonjudgmental. She made inroads as a

result. After she retired, she remained in New Hampshire and remained close with her colleagues at the center.

Miriam passed away last month at the age of 88, and she will be sorely missed. Her legacy, though, will live on through her family and through the lasting impact she made on children and families throughout New Hampshire.

I hope that you join me in honoring the life of a champion for all children, Miriam Stahl.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 20, 2020, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2330. An act to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to provide for congressional oversight of the board of directors of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee and to protect amateur athletes from emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 2638. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to require small hub airports to construct areas for nursing mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 3051. An act to improve protections for wildlife, and for other purposes.

S. 3758. An act to amend the Klamath Basin Water Supply Enhancement Act of 2000 to make certain technical corrections.

S. 4075. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for the release of certain Federal interests in connection with certain grants under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4762. An act to designate the airport traffic control tower located at Piedmont Triad International Airport in Greensboro, North Carolina, as the "Senator Kay Hagan Airport Traffic Control Tower".

#### 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-5612. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's 2020 compensation program adjustments; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5613. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Registration and Compliance Requirements for Commodity Pool Operators and Commodity Trading Advisors: Prohibiting Exemptions Under Regulation 4.13 on Behalf of Persons Subject to Certain Statutory Disqualifications" (RIN3038-AE76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5614. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy of Consumer Financial Information" (RIN3038-AE91) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5615. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Retail Commodity Transactions Involving Certain Digital Assets" (RIN3038-AE62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5616. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Trinexapac-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 10012-51-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5617. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Calcium Pantothenate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 10015-71-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5618. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Thiamine Mononitrate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 10015-69-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5619. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions" ((RIN0579-AE49) (Docket No. APHIS-2018-0062)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5620. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5621. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry;

to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5622. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13894 of October 14, 2019, with respect to the situation in and in relation to Syria, and in particular the recent actions by the Government of Turkey to conduct a military offensive into northeast Syria; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5623. A communication from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enhancing and Streamlining the Implementation of Section 3 Requirements for Creating Economic Opportunities for Low- and Very Low-Income Persons and Eligible Businesses" (RIN2501-AD87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5624. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds" (RIN3038-AE93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5625. A communication from the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Statement of Policy on Applications for Early Termination of Consent Orders" (12 CFR Chapter X) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5626. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Whistleblower Program Rules" (RIN3235-AM11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5627. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modernization of Regulation S-K Items 101, 103, and 105" (RIN3235-AL78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5628. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedural Requirements and Resubmission Thresholds under Exchange Act Rule 14a-8" (Release No. 34-89964) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5629. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fund of Funds Arrangements" (RIN3235-AM29) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5630. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled “Publication or Submission of Quotations Without Specified Information” (RIN3235-AM54) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5631. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Electric Reliability Organization Proposal to Retire Requirements in Reliability Standards Under the NERC Standards Efficiency Review” (RIN1902-AF69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5632. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; Control of Particulate Matter and Visible Emissions” (FRL No. 10013-47-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5633. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Volatile Organic Compounds” (FRL No. 10015-49-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5634. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; Attainment Plan for the Indiana, Pennsylvania Nonattainment Area for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard” (FRL No. 10015-78-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5635. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; South Coast Moderate Area Plan and Reclassification as Serious Nonattainment for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS” (FRL No. 10015-43-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5636. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Revisions to Emissions Reporting Requirements” (FRL No. 10014-13-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5637. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Findings of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plans Required for Attainment of the 2010 1-Hour Primary Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS)” (FRL No. 10015-79-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5638. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semichemical Pulp Mills; Standards of Performance for Kraft Pulp Mill Affected Sources for Which Construction, Reconstruction, or Modification Commenced After May 23, 2013” (FRL No. 10015-72-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5639. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arizona; Nonattainment Plan for the Hayden SO<sub>2</sub> Nonattainment Area” (FRL No. 10014-48-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5640. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulatory Guide (RG) 7.4, Revision 2, ‘Leakage Tests on Packages for Shipment of Radioactive Material’” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5641. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulatory Guide (RG) 3.72 ‘Guidance for Implementation of 10 CFR 72.48, Changes, Tests, and Experiments’” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5642. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.236, Revision 0, ‘Pressurized-Water Reactor Control Rod Ejection and Boiling-Water Reactor Control Rod Drop Accidents’” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 14, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5643. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulatory Guide (RG) 5.61, Revision 0, ‘Intent and Scope of the Physical Protection Upgrade Rule Requirements for Fixed Sites’” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5644. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Environmental Considerations Associated with Micro-reactors” (10 CFR Parts 50 and 52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5645. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Knowledge and Abilities Catalog for Nuclear Power Plant Operators: Boiling Water Reactors” (NUREG-1123) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5646. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Knowledge and Abilities Catalog for Nuclear Power Plant Operators: Pressurized Water Reactors, Revision 3” (NUREG-1122) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5647. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Utah; Regional Haze 5-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan” (FRL No. 10015-23-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5648. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; West Virginia; Redesignation of the Marshall Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Area’s Maintenance Plan” (FRL No. 10015-34-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5649. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; New Hampshire; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2015 Ozone and 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standards” (FRL No. 10015-24-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5650. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Jefferson County Administrative Procedures” (FRL No. 10015-13-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5651. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act” (FRL No. 10014-50-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3099. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-281).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3100. A bill to convey land in Anchorage, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Tribal Health



Consortium, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-282).

### 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 Mr. BRAUN:

S. 4812. A bill to provide the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State with temporary direct hire authority for certain positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 4813. A bill to support United States policy toward Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4814. A bill to ensure that sales, exports, or transfers of F-35 aircraft do not compromise the qualitative military edge of the United States or Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4815. A bill to provide for a National Disaster Safety Board; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 4816. A bill to establish the Southern Maryland National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 4817. A bill to modify the 7(a) loan guaranty program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KING, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4818. A bill to provide assistance to small businesses affected by COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 4819. A bill to improve the health of minority individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 4820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the use of retirement plan funds to obtain long-term care insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4821. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to clarify that utility line technicians qualify as emergency response providers; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4822. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax benefits for research activities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4823. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to create a national zero-emission vehicle standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 748. A resolution congratulating the Seattle Storm women's basketball team on winning the 2020 Women's National Basketball Association Championship; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 749. A resolution denouncing the Maduro regime's efforts to hold fraudulent legislative elections, the absence of acceptable conditions to ensure free, fair, and transparent electoral processes in Venezuela, and the further erosion of Venezuelan democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 511

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 511, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 997

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 997, a bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1374

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1418

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms.

DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1418, a bill to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1687

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1687, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for certain casualty losses of uncut timber.

S. 1700

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1700, a bill to provide a temporary safe harbor for publishers of online content to collectively negotiate with dominant online platforms regarding the terms on which content may be distributed.

S. 2246

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2246, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide equal coverage of in vitro specific IgE tests and percutaneous tests for allergies under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2477

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2477, a bill to establish a National Commission on Fibrotic Diseases.

S. 2561

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2561, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 2842

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 3072

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3072, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the approval of new abortion drugs, to prohibit investigational use exemptions for abortion drugs, and to impose additional regulatory requirements with respect to previously approved abortion drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 3182

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3182, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 3353

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3353, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients, and for other purposes.

S. 3471

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors 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.

S. 3684

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3684, a bill to make supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Agriculture, the Interior, Homeland Security, Labor, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 3686

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3686, a bill to provide for parental notification and intervention in the case of an unemancipated minor seeking an abortion.

S. 3722

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3722, a bill to authorize funding for a bilateral cooperative program with Israel for the development of health technologies with a focus on combating COVID-19.

S. 3812

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3812, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include veterans of World War II.

S. 3967

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 3967, a bill to reform Federal Aviation Administration safety requirements for commercial air tour operators, and for other purposes.

S. 4012

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 4012, a bill to establish a \$120,000,000,000 Restaurant Revitalization Fund to provide structured relief to food service or drinking establishments through December 31, 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 4212

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4212, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to strip foreign sovereign immunity of certain foreign states to secure justice for victims of novel coronavirus in the United States.

S. 4216

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4216, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct studies and report to Congress on actions taken to expand access to telehealth services under the Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance programs during the COVID-19 emergency.

S. 4225

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4225, a bill to establish authority to destroy counterfeit devices offered for import, and for other purposes.

S. 4255

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4255, a bill to amend the CARES Act to establish community investment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 4258

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 4258, a bill to establish a grant program for small live venue operators and talent representatives.

S. 4349

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4349, a bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals.

S. 4380

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4380, a bill to provide redress to the employees of Air America.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4380, *supra*.

S. 4395

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4395, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to authorize maritime transportation emergency relief, and for other purposes.

S. 4426

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4426, a bill to establish an Office of Subnational Diplomacy within the Department of State, and for other purposes.

S. 4555

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4555, a bill to reauthorize funding for programs to prevent, investigate, and prosecute elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation, and for other purposes.

S. 4564

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4564, a bill to authorize the location of a memorial on the National Mall to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces that served on active duty in support of the Global War on Terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 4657

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4657, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate one week each year as "Buddy Check Week" for the purpose of outreach and education concerning peer wellness checks for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 4701

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4701, a bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to future interstate designations, and for other purposes.

S. 4764

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4764, a bill to require the Secretary of

Housing and Urban Development to establish a pilot program for public-private partnerships for disaster mitigation projects, and for other purposes.

S. 4799

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4799, a bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to forced abortions by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

S. 4805

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 4805, a bill to create a point of order against legislation modifying the number of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

S.J. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of not more than 9 justices.

S.J. RES. 76

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 76, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of nine justices.

S. CON. RES. 49

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASAN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator

from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 49, a concurrent resolution mandating procedures to ensure adequate precautions against COVID-19 in Senate buildings.

S. RES. 679

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 679, a resolution expressing appreciation and support for essential employees with disabilities or who are blind during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond.

S. RES. 680

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 680, a resolution condemning the People's Republic of China's use of military aggression to change the status quo at the Line of Actual Control between India and China.

S. RES. 689

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) 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. 709

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors 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.

S. RES. 716

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 716, a resolution designating the week of October 5 through October 9, 2020, as "Malnutrition Awareness Week".

S. RES. 745

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of 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.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 4819. A bill to improve the health of minority individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, there is no shortage of examples showing how our Nation systemically fails communities of color and other minorities, but the events of 2020—namely COVID-19 and the killings of Black Americans—have brought heightened attention and urgency to addressing inequities and disparities throughout our nation. Tragically, these inequities and disparities pervade our health care system, resulting in poor health outcomes and barriers to care for far too many communities.

Mr. President, I believe that healthcare is a right—not a privilege—and that this right should extend to everyone in our Nation. Yet, this is not the case. Our Nation falls short in ensuring that right to everyone regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, immigration status, or any other factor, which is why I am reintroducing the Health Equity and Accountability Act (HEAA). This bill is a comprehensive blueprint of bold policy solutions that address a wide spectrum of health equity concerns.

Despite progress made through the Affordable Care Act, health care access remains a problem in the U.S., with minority communities disproportionately facing barriers to coverage. HEAA expands access to health care for many communities in need including immigrant communities, rural communities, and of particular importance to my state, citizens of the Freely Associated States who are living in our country under the Compacts of Free Association.

We know that diversity in our health care workforce can improve health outcomes, and yet racial and ethnic minorities remain underrepresented in our health professions. HEAA seeks to address the lack of diversity in our health workforce through loan repayment programs and health professions fellowships. The bill would also help providers better serve a diverse patient population with culturally and linguistically appropriate health care services through investments like cultural competency education and expanded language access services to assist the over 12 percent of Hawaii residents and about 8 percent of people nationwide with limited English proficiency.

Women, children, and adolescents often face additional barriers and disparities in accessing information, health education, health services, and coverage. HEAA aims to dismantle those barriers and address a range of infant, maternal, sexual, and reproductive health needs, particularly for

marginalized and underserved communities. For example, HEAA would invest in sexual health education for underserved, minority, and LGBTQ youth and link them to services related to positive health behaviors. The bill also seeks to address our country's tragically high maternal mortality rate, particularly for Black women, who have a maternal mortality rate three to five times that of White women. HEAA would expand services to pregnant and postpartum women, develop maternal health initiatives in rural areas, and establish a program to address implicit biases and cultural competency in providers.

HEAA doesn't stop there. The legislation would also expand and promote mental and behavioral health services for minority communities, increase Federal resources for diseases that disproportionately affect minorities—such as heart disease and diabetes in Native Hawaiians—and improve data collection and reporting so we can more completely recognize and address health disparities. In Hawaii, these investments through HEAA will help combat diseases like viral hepatitis, which disproportionately affects Asian Americans, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander communities, and better understand the health disparities faced by Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders through disaggregated data collection.

Finally, HEAA addresses the “social determinants of health”—non-medical factors like the environment, housing, education, and economic stability that ultimately affect individual and community health. HEAA would require non-health federal agencies like Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Transportation, Department of Agriculture, and Environmental Protection Agency to work together to improve the social determinants of health.

Achieving health equity is achievable and to do it we must make bold, substantial investments in transforming our health and health care systems. I thank my colleagues for joining me in introducing the bill, and encourage others to join us as we work to level the playing field and empower everyone in our nation to achieve their full health potential.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 748—CONGRATULATING THE SEATTLE STORM WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM ON WINNING THE 2020 WOMEN'S NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 748

Whereas, on October 6, 2020, the Seattle Storm women's basketball team (referred to in this preamble as the “Seattle Storm”) won the 2020 Women's National Basketball Association (referred to in this preamble as the “WNBA”) Championship;

Whereas the 2020 WNBA Championship is the fourth national championship that the Seattle Storm has won and the second national championship that the team has won in 3 years;

Whereas the Seattle Storm won the final game of the 2020 WNBA finals with the largest margin of victory in the history of the WNBA finals;

Whereas, during the 2020 WNBA playoffs, the Seattle Storm bested the Minnesota Lynx women's basketball team in the WNBA conference finals and beat the Las Vegas Aces women's basketball team in the WNBA finals;

Whereas the Seattle Storm led the 2020 WNBA season in points per game, assists per game, and three-pointers;

Whereas the players of the 2020 Seattle Storm championship team, including Sue Bird, Jordin Canada, Alysha Clark, Natasha Howard, Crystal Langhorne, Jewell Loyd, Ezi Magbegor, Epiphanny Price, Mercedes Russell, Breanna Stewart, Morgan Tuck, and Sami Whitcomb, exhibited extraordinary teamwork;

Whereas Breanna Stewart—

(1) received the WNBA Finals Most Valuable Player award for the second time in 2020, having received that award and the WNBA League Most Valuable Player award in 2018, and

(2) was named the 2020 WNBA Comeback Player of the Year after missing the 2019 season with a torn Achilles tendon;

Whereas Alysha Clark received the 2020 Defensive Player of the Year award;

Whereas Sue Bird—

(1) finished her 17th season in the WNBA with the Seattle Storm, having played in every WNBA Championship series game in which the Storm has participated;

(2) leads the WNBA with 2,888 career assists; and

(3) has played more WNBA games than other player in the history of the WNBA;

Whereas, during the 2020 WNBA season, the Seattle Storm was led by Head Coach Gary Kloppenburg and Assistant Coaches Ryan Webb and Noelle Quinn;

Whereas the players of the Seattle Storm were supported during the 2020 WNBA season by the dedicated operational and medical staff, including Talisa Rhea, Perry Huang, Emily Blurton, Caroline Durocher, Susan Borchardt, Dr. Michael Erickson, Dr. Jeff Cary, Abby Gordan, Dustin Williams, Erica Nash, Hunter Johnson, Mel Cable, and Brooke Tyler;

Whereas the owners of the Seattle Storm, Lisa Brummel, Dawn Trudeau, and Ginny Gilder, are 1 of just 2 all-female ownership groups in the WNBA;

Whereas the Seattle Storm has exhibited dedication to making a social impact by strengthening communities through the StormCares partnership, a partnership between the Seattle Storm and organizations in the greater Puget Sound region; and

Whereas the dedication and hard work of the Seattle Storm have inspired and empowered girls, boys, women, and men of all ages: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate recognizes—

(1) the achievements of the players, coaches, fans, and staff of the Seattle Storm women's basketball team, whose dedication helped the team win the 2020 Women's National Basketball Association Championship;

(2) the State of Washington and the city of Seattle for their enthusiastic support of women's professional basketball; and

(3) the continuing progress toward ensuring equity in men's and women's professional sports.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 749—DENOUNCING THE MADURO REGIME'S EFFORTS TO HOLD FRAUDULENT LEGISLATIVE ELECTIONS, THE ABSENCE OF ACCEPTABLE CONDITIONS TO ENSURE FREE, FAIR, AND TRANSPARENT ELECTORAL PROCESSES IN VENEZUELA, AND THE FURTHER EROSION OF VENEZUELAN DEMOCRACY

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 749

Whereas the regime of Nicolás Maduro is undertaking efforts to hold fraudulent legislative elections for Venezuela's National Assembly in December 2020 that will not comply with international standards for free, fair, and transparent electoral processes;

Whereas the Maduro regime is seeking to use fraudulent legislative elections to undermine Venezuela's sitting democratically elected National Assembly;

Whereas, as codified under section 112 of the VERDAD Act of 2019 (22 U.S.C. 9702), it is the policy of the United States to recognize the democratically elected National Assembly of Venezuela, elected in December 2015 and sworn in on January 2016, as the only legitimate national legislative body in Venezuela;

Whereas the United States Government and members of the international community have rightly denounced the Maduro regime's efforts to hold fraudulent legislative elections in December 2020;

Whereas, on October 13, 2020, members of the Lima Group—including Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela—issued a joint declaration on the Maduro regime's efforts to hold legislative elections in December 2020 that expressed “firm rejection of the continuing of the illegitimate regime of Nicolás Maduro in holding parliamentary elections without the minimum democratic guarantees and without the participation of all political forces”;

Whereas, on September 17, 2020, the International Contact Group on Venezuela—whose members include Argentina, Costa Rica, Ecuador, the European Union, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and Uruguay—issued a joint declaration on the Maduro regime's efforts to hold legislative elections in December 2020 that stated that “conditions are not met, at the moment, for a transparent, inclusive, free and fair electoral process”;

Whereas, on June 12, 2020, the Maduro regime's illegitimate Supreme Court unilaterally appointed new members to Venezuela's National Electoral Council without the approval of the democratically elected National Assembly;

Whereas, throughout 2020, the Maduro regime—

(1) sought to coopt and undermine independent political parties through a campaign of systematic persecution; and

(2) used its discredited Supreme Court to strip independent political parties of their leadership, including Voluntad Popular, Primero Justicia, and Acción Democrática;

Whereas the Maduro regime has a demonstrated track record of holding fraudulent elections over the last four years;

Whereas, on July 30, 2017, the Maduro regime manipulated the results for Venezuela's Constituent Assembly by more than 1,000,000 votes, according to Smartmatic, the company that supplied Venezuela's electronic voting machines;

Whereas, in May 2018, the Maduro regime held fraudulent presidential elections that were broadly criticized as illegitimate, leading more 50 countries to recognize the end of Nicolás Maduro's term in office and the inauguration of National Assembly President Juan Guaidó as Interim-President of Venezuela on January 23, 2019;

Whereas, according to the Venezuelan constitution, Juan Guaidó, as President of the National Assembly, serves as Venezuela's Interim President in the absence of democratically elected president of Venezuela;

Whereas the conditions do not currently exist for the free, fair, and transparent election of new members of the National Assembly or the president of Venezuela;

Whereas, as of September 7, 2020, the internationally recognized nongovernmental organization Foro Penal confirmed that, out of the 110 individuals recently released from prison by the Maduro regime to serve out the remainder of their sentences under house arrest, 53 were political prisoners, and that currently 363 political prisoners remain unjustly detained by the dictatorship without due process;

Whereas, on September 16, 2020, the United Nations Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela found that Nicolás Maduro and senior members of his regime ordered and carried out a campaign of extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, torture, and arbitrary detentions that amounted to systemic crimes against humanity;

Whereas the Maduro regime's efforts to hold fraudulent legislative elections, undermine the democratically elected National Assembly and independent political parties, and implement a campaign of state-sponsored violence and repression further erodes democracy and the rule of law in Venezuela; and

Whereas, as codified under section 4 of the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act (Public Law 113-278; 128 U.S.C. 3013), it is the policy of the United States "to support the people of Venezuela in their aspiration to live under conditions of peace and representative democracy as defined by the Inter-American Democratic Charter of the Organization of American States": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) denounces efforts by the Maduro regime to hold fraudulent legislative elections in an effort to undermine Venezuela's democratically elected National Assembly;

(2) joins members of the international community, including members of the Lima Group, in rightfully rejecting the Maduro's regime efforts to carry out fraudulent legislative elections;

(3) urges that presidential and legislative elections in Venezuela be conducted at the earliest possible date according to international standards for free, fair, and transparent electoral processes, including credible international election observation;

(4) calls on the Maduro regime to cease its campaign of systematic persecution against Venezuela's independent political parties and their leadership;

(5) calls on the Maduro regime to immediately release all political prisoners, facilitate access by humanitarian organizations, and end its campaign of extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, torture, and arbitrary detentions of political opponents, human rights defenders, civil society activists, peaceful protesters, and citizens; and

(6) takes note of the finding of the United Nations Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela that the Maduro regime's campaign of state-sponsored violence and repression against the people of Venezuela amounted to crimes against humanity, and calls for Nicolás Maduro and senior members of his regime to be held accountable for their actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

## RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I move to recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

The motion is agreed to.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:50 p.m., stands in recess until Wednesday, October 21, 2020, at 12 noon.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MICHAEL T. PLEHN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

#### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. RYAN T. OKAHARA

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. MARLON E. CROOK

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. DONALD R. BEVIS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN M. WEEK

### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. GEORGE N. APPENZELLER

### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD D. HEINZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. WESLEY R. MCCALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KEVIN P. LENOX

### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be colonel

MICHAEL G. KING

### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### To be colonel

JOHN M. TOKISH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### To be colonel

MARK Y. LEE

### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 605:

#### To be captain

RAUL T. ACEVEDO  
SAMANTHA A. DUTILY  
TERRENCE E. FROST  
JOHN M. HALTTUNEN  
JUSTIN T. ISSLER  
ROBERT S. JONES  
JAMES A. MORROW  
MATTHIAS J. VORACHEK

#### To be commander

MIGUEL D. CHARLES  
JASON A. FITE  
DANIEL T. JONES  
HENRY J. KENNEDY  
PATRICK L. MCCLERNON  
JEREMIAH S. SHUMWAY  
ANDREW W. TOM  
MATTHEW P. WARNECKE

#### To be lieutenant commander

ADAM K. ALBRECHT  
DAVID M. ALLEN  
KYLE C. ARNESON  
NATHAN D. ASHINHURST  
HARRISON B. ASKEW  
MICHAEL H. AVERY  
JASON F. BAITINGER  
BRANDON L. BARKER  
JASON B. BARKER  
JAMES D. BARNES  
ALEXANDER J. BODDIFORD  
DAVID A. BRADLEY  
CHASE F. BROWN  
VANESSA D. BROWN  
JOSEPH A. BUONACCORSO  
WILLIAM R. CARTER III  
CARLOS R. CEPEDA  
DANIEL K. CHAPMAN  
EVAN E. CHRISTMAN  
PATRICK J. CONNAWAY  
KENNETH W. DECKER  
TIMOTHY R. DENNELLY  
MATTHEW S. DESROSIER  
ASHLEE J. DILLARDHOUSTON  
KEVIN P. DOYLE, JR.  
TONY G. DUNLAVY  
DANIEL E. ESPINOZA  
ALEXANDER J. FISHMAN  
DANIEL M. GALGINATTIS  
JOHN W. GANNON  
MARIO A. GRANATA  
TYRELL S. GRANT  
HAMILTON R. GUBANC  
BRIAN R. GURECK  
JOHN H. HADDAD  
ANDREW C. HAINES  
HARLEY S. HARP  
JACKSON W. HUMMELDORF  
JASON C. INGRAM  
WILLIAM B. JONES  
CHRISTOPHER L. KAMINSKY  
DANIEL J. KINDERVATER  
JOHN A. LAWLER  
HEATHER I. LEE  
PHILIP S. LEE  
JOHNNIE R. LOWERY, JR.  
OWEN H. LYNCH  
SAMANTHA F. MARGOLIS  
MICHAEL J. MARTIN  
MICHAEL A. MARTINEZ  
ANTONIO E. MIRANDA  
BRIAN T. MOORE  
CHRISTOPHER C. MORGAN  
RYAN D. MULLIN  
CHRISTOPHER M. MURRAY  
JOSEPH P. NEWMAN  
ALEXANDER P. PAPADAKOS

ANDREW J. PARKER  
ERIC E. PAUL  
NICHOLAS M. PULIDO  
JOEL T. RALEY, JR.  
BENJAMIN W. RATHWELL  
TIMOTHY A. REEVES II  
KRISTOPHER S. RESTEL  
JASON C. ROBERTS  
MARCO V. ROCHE  
ROBERTO S. P. ROSALES  
THOMAS J. SCOGGINS  
DAVID J. SPAULDING  
BRIAN A. STANFIELD  
ANDREW C. TAYLOR  
MICHAEL J. TENAGLIA  
ANTHONY P. TESTINO  
JAMES E. THOMAS  
CARLOS S. TRAVERIA  
KEVIN P. TULLOCH  
TRAVIS M. TURNER  
MICHAEL G. WALKER  
DANIEL J. WILKINS  
BRETT R. WILLIAMS  
BENNIE R. WOODS, JR.  
SHEU O. YUSUF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*

BRANDEN J. ALBRECHT  
ADAM M. ALLEMAN  
BLAINE M. ALLGOOD  
ANDREW V. ANDERSON  
KENNETH W. ANDERSON  
STEPHEN L. ASTAFAN  
FREDERIK J. AULVELD  
RHETT C. BARKER  
MICHAEL J. BARTON  
CHRISTOPHER M. BATTAGELLO  
JUAN C. BENAVIDESBAYAS  
JASON M. BENTLEY  
JEFFREY R. BLAND  
DAVID A. BOWLIN  
RYAN J. CAHILL  
CARISSALINA Q. CALISTE  
ELIAZAR D. CAMPOS  
ALEX CHERY  
BRANDON J. CLEARY  
STACIA L. A. CLUTTS  
DAVID B. CONNELL  
ALEXANDER J. COOPER  
ZEFERINO CORTESRODRIGUEZ  
ELIZABETH M. COURTNEY  
RYAN M. CRAM  
DANIEL E. CRIPE  
MICHAEL A. CURTIS  
FRANCISCO J. DEGOLLADO  
NICHOLAS D. DESCHAMPS  
ANTHONY J. DESPOTA  
AARON B. DIAZ  
GLADYS V. DIAZ  
RICARDO ELIZALDEVALENCIA  
ROBERT L. FORD  
ANDREA P. FRANCIS  
MICHAEL P. FRANKHOUSER  
TYRONIE M. GARBUTT  
LORENZO GARNER, JR.  
TIMOTHY M. GEIL  
CHRISTOPHER T. GERBER  
JOSEPH GREEN III  
NEAL R. GREENLUND  
STEPHEN C. HALL  
JACOB A. HAMILTON  
LISA A. HARDMAN  
JOHN A. HARMONY  
EDWARD B. HAVEL  
EMILY J. HAWKINS  
FAITHANN M. HAWKINS  
JEREMY L. HOBBS  
LUCAS J. HORAN  
WALTER R. HUSSONG II  
HENSLEY G. HYLTON  
BRETT R. JACOBS  
ELISA M. JAIME  
CHARLES E. JAMISON  
JESSICA JIMENEZ  
JASMUEL J. JORDAN  
SAMUEL S. JORDAN  
ALEXANDER M. JULIAN  
BRIGID M. JURGENS  
KEVIN M. KIM  
DARTANYON R. KING  
GREGORY M. KRANZ  
JACOB C. LAIRD  
TIMOTHY N. LANDRY  
MAYNARD K. LEE  
JUSTIN A. LEMONS  
BLAKE J. LINGAD  
TUCKER M. LIVINGSTON  
MICHAEL S. LUCAS  
LUIS E. LUY, JR.  
WILLIAM J. LYNCH  
SAMUEL E. MACAVOY  
MARK D. G. MACSULE  
STEVEN A. MAKUCH  
JOSHUA A. MANSILLA  
MICHAEL S. MARCHESI  
NATHANIEL T. MARLOW  
GARY E. MAURER  
MICHAEL T. MCCALL  
BRENDAN P. MCCREARY  
SHAUN P. MCGAHAN  
PHILLIP E. MCGINNIS  
BENJAMIN D. MCCLAURY  
FRANKLIN D. MIDDLEBROOKS

DERRICK D. MILLER  
ERIC MIN  
JEFFREY L. MORGAN  
DAVID W. OH  
CHRISTOPHER D. OKIMURA  
DERRICK D. OLSON  
BRYAN H. PACE  
GARRETT A. PACE  
JOHN M. PALERMO  
KRISTINA M. PARMENTER  
RONALD R. PARRY  
CODY R. PERNA  
JONNY M. PERRY  
LEON A. PINHEIRO  
JARED J. PITTS  
JASON L. POTVIN  
MATTHEW N. REDMOND  
ERIC J. RICHEY  
FRANKLIN D. ROBERSON II  
PHILIP N. ROBINSON  
PABLO J. RODRIGUEZ  
DEREK A. RONCAIOLI  
ERIK M. RUTTER  
GUSTAVO B. SANTOS  
THOMAS M. SCHWANDER  
ERIC A. SCOGGINS  
JARRETT A. SEIBEL  
AARON J. SHINOFF  
RYAN N. SHIPLEY  
TAYLOR A. SHIPLEY  
SAMUEL D. SHORTS  
JUSTIN M. SHULL  
CHRISTOPHER W. SMITH  
TERRENCE L. SMITH  
CHAD D. STEVENSON  
ANDREW P. STILLERMAN  
MATTHEW G. STYMFAL  
VINCENT V. TES  
TAMSYN O. THOMPSON  
ERNESTO B. TIONGCO III  
ELLIOT J. TORRESRIVERA  
TIMOTHY S. TRASK, JR.  
ROBERT M. VALLANCE  
CORY D. VANDIVIER  
TYLER R. VAUGHAN  
MICHAEL J. VAZANA  
JOHN P. WAGGENER  
MICAH R. WALLIN  
RYAN T. WARD  
CHRISTOPHER B. WELLS  
JOHN T. WELSH  
MATTHEW R. WILKENS  
HEATHER L. WILKINS  
MANYIN C. WILLIAMS  
JACOB P. WILLIAMSON  
ROSANNE M. WITT  
KIM L. WONG  
DANIEL S. WRIGHT  
BRANDY L. ZEHR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*

MARK E. BEAUDET  
MICHAEL D. BROWN  
ALEXANDER J. CHO  
JISUP CHOI  
CURTISS P. DWYER  
ETHAN M. EVERTS  
BRIAN D. GIBBONS  
AUSTIN R. GRIMES  
DAVID C. HOSTETTLER  
TAKANA L. JEFFERSON  
KENNETH T. JEWELL  
LARRY L. JONES, JR.  
BRIAN E. MYERS  
WILLIAM E. NEWSOME  
HARDY G. OWENS  
LAURA E. PALMER  
EMILY B. ROSENZWEIG  
WESLEY E. SCHOLTZ  
MARK R. SIMONSEN  
KENNETH M. STILES  
DONELSON THEVENIN  
COLBY R. TORRES  
CHARLES M. WISE  
MARK J. WON  
ZACHARY B. ZUMWALT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*

CHRISTOPHER L. ADCOCK  
DAMIAN R. ALLEN  
STEPHEN V. BAKER  
RYAN C. BARRETT  
MICHAEL A. BOHN  
TRAVIS O. BOLES  
JAMES A. BRUNO  
AARON V. BUREN  
DYLAN L. M. BUSH  
CHRISTIAN J. CAPRON  
MAJELLEN C. CHANGCOCO  
REECE E. COMER III  
DANIEL M. CURELY  
TIMOTHY R. DAHMS  
ANDREW D. DESCARY  
ANDRES ESPINOSA FELICIANO  
TYSON D. FENNER  
GENEVIEVE F. FLATGARD  
YAHMAINE FORD  
RICHARD K. FORNEY  
PETER D. FOVARGUE

DENIQUA S. FREDDIE  
NATALIA GERENASANTIAGO  
JEREMIAH D. GILL  
MELANIE R. GRIGSBY  
VAUGHN A. HAMMANG  
CHRISTOPHER L. HEBERT  
BLAINE A. HENNING  
ANGEL HERRERA, JR.  
ADAM R. HOMEWOOD  
ALLISON W. ISLIN  
RHETT S. JOHNSON  
SETH D. JONES  
LUCAS E. KEISER  
MARCUS F. KNOLL  
AARON R. KOTLARZ  
AARON S. KULP  
MARY W. LEONE  
JEDEDIAH C. LOMAX  
MATTHEW T. LUNDIN  
PAUL A. MANGLONA, JR.  
CAROLINE Y. MASTRANGELLO  
DANIEL H. MCDONALD  
DAMIAN MENDOZA  
CHARLES F. MURDOCK  
RORY J. OBOYLE  
THEODORE D. PACKOWSKI II  
NATHAN B. PLUMEY  
ALLISON C. PONTAL  
CODY N. ROBERTSON  
AARON K. SAMUELSON  
RYAN W. SAWYER  
DAVID G. SCHULTZ  
WILLIAM M. SHORT  
GREGORY M. SHULTZ  
PAUL E. SIMPSON  
SCOTT D. SOBIERALSKI  
NICHOLAS P. SWEET  
NICHOLAS E. THOMPSON  
LAUREN N. WAKEFIELD  
MATTHEW G. WARD  
SCOTT D. WIESER  
ANTONI WYSZYNSKI  
MICHAEL S. YEARY  
STEVEN C. YEE  
MICHAEL J. YOSHIHARA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*

JASON E. HAYES  
JEREMIAH P. HILL  
CHRISTOPHER S. WALTON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MA-  
RINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

WILLIAM J. WARKENTIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MA-  
RINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

JARED L. REDDINGER

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE IN-  
DICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(E):

*To be commander*

MICHAEL S. ADAMS, JR.  
JOHN C. ADAMS  
RYAN F. ADAMS  
LISA M. AGUIRRE  
JENNIFER P. AHEARN  
WILLIAM C. ALBRIGHT  
HALE A. ALLEGRETTI  
NICHOLAS M. ANDERSON  
PATRICK N. ARMSTRONG  
HUNTER T. ATHERTON  
NICOLE D. AUTH  
LEE D. BACON  
KRISTEN N. BAKER  
STEVEN J. BALDOVSKY  
JEFFERY C. BARNUM  
ROGER B. BARR  
YAMARIS D. BARRIL  
NICHOLAS A. BARROW  
SEAN H. BARTONICEK  
PHILIP S. BAXA  
EILEEN BECK  
WILLIAM W. BELCHER  
MICHAEL S. BELL  
ARIEL BERRIOS  
NATALIA M. BEST  
SAMUEL A. BLASE  
TIMOTHY E. BOETTNER  
STEPHEN BOR  
AMALIA D. BOYER  
SARAH E. BRENNAN  
MATTHEW P. BRINKLEY  
MARK H. BROWN  
JOSHUA W. BUCK  
JESSICA W. BURRELL  
JEFF B. BYBEE  
ERIN M. CALDWELL  
JASON R. CAMERON  
JANE N. CARLEY  
CHRISTOPHER D. CART  
REY F. CASTILLO



LESLIE R. CLARK  
 JOEL C. COITTO  
 TRAVIS S. COLLIER  
 MICHAEL P. CORTESE  
 WILLIAM F. COTY III  
 TIMOTHY N. CRONIN  
 THOMAS S. CROWLEY  
 KRISTEN A. CURRAN  
 GREGORY T. DAHL  
 CAREN C. DAMON  
 ADAM M. DAVENPORT  
 HOLLY J. DEAL  
 ANTHONY M. DESTEFANO  
 EDWARD L. DIPIERO  
 JOSHUA M. DIPIETRO  
 JOHN Z. DOWNING  
 MEGAN L. DREWNIAK  
 KRISTIN P. DRISCOLL  
 JAYME L. DUBINSKY  
 MICHAEL S. DYKEMA  
 PATTON J. EPPERSON  
 SCOTT L. FARR  
 BOBBIE-JEAN FELIX  
 MICHAEL P. FELTOVIC  
 MICHELLE FERGUSON  
 BRIAN M. FINN  
 SUSAN M. FISCHER  
 BRIAN D. FITZPATRICK  
 KARYN S. FORSYTH  
 DIANNA D. GARFIELD  
 LUDWIG R. GAZVODA  
 ANGELIQUE M. GEYER  
 WESLEY M. GEYER  
 EMILY M. GIBBONS  
 MICHAEL S. GLINSKI  
 PHILIP J. GRANATI  
 JEANNETTE M. GREENE  
 GEORGE F. HALL  
 KARIMA A. HANTAL  
 JARED A. HARLOW  
 JONATHAN R. HARRIS  
 ANNA M. HART  
 JOSEPH H. HART  
 RYAN D. HAWN  
 WILLIAM K. HAYWOOD  
 TYLER K. HEFFNER  
 RYAN P. HENEBERY  
 KIMBERLY A. HESS  
 KELLY L. HIGGINS  
 JEFFREY S. HOLM  
 ROBERT M. HUNTER  
 JEFFERY B. HUSTACE  
 ELIZABETH A. HUTTON  
 JESSE E. HYLES  
 CHRISTOPHER A. JASNOCH

NOEL H. JOHNSON  
 FRANCES S. JOHNSON-GILLION  
 MATTHEW V. KEMPE  
 DANIEL P. KILCULLEN  
 CHRISTOPHER J. KLEIN  
 JASON M. KLING  
 SCOTT R. KOSER  
 BRIAN A. KUDRLE  
 NICHOLAS D. LEITER  
 JOHN M. LISKO  
 AMY M. LOCKWOOD  
 GREGORY R. LYNCH  
 DAVID S. MACCAFERRI  
 ANDREW P. MADJESKA  
 ARTHUR P. MAHAR  
 HEATHER M. MAJESKA  
 MATTHEW L. MARKOS  
 JUSTIN M. MATEJKA  
 DAVID P. MCCARTHY  
 JENNIFER A. MCKAY  
 DAVID M. MCLOUGHLIN  
 JACOB T. MCMILLAN  
 DANIEL J. MCQUATE  
 ADRIAN P. MICHALSKI  
 CHRISTOPHER J. MILLER  
 RYAN C. MILLER  
 GARY R. MILLS  
 STEPHEN R. MIROS  
 MATTHEW J. MITCHELL  
 CHRISTIAN G. MIURA  
 JEREMY J. MONTES  
 KIRA M. MOODY  
 KATHRYN A. MORETTI  
 MICHAEL C. MORGAN  
 FRANKLIN J. MORRISON  
 MATTHEW K. MOTHANDER  
 GINNY R. NADOLNY  
 ERICK M. NEUSSL  
 ELIZABETH J. NEWTON  
 JOHN E. NOTO  
 WAYNE T. O'DONNELL, JR.  
 JEFFREY K. PADILLA  
 HOON PARK  
 TREVOR E. PARRA  
 ADAM A. PAUL  
 JONATHAN C. PERRY  
 KRYSLA V. POHL  
 BRITTANY C. POLEY  
 RYAN B. POPIEL  
 EDWARD L. PORTER  
 CHRISTOPHER D. PRESNELL  
 STEVEN L. PUFFER  
 DAVID W. RATNER  
 RAYMOND J. REICHL  
 CORY A. RIESTERER

JOSEPH E. RIZZO  
 NATHANIEL L. ROBINSON  
 CHRISTOPHER C. ROSEN  
 MICHAEL T. ROSS  
 SARAH K. ROUSSEAU  
 ERIC E. ROY  
 KYLE T. RUSSELL  
 GEOFFREY A. SAHLIN  
 JOSEPH R. SEMKE  
 LINDSEY E. SENIUK  
 NICHOLAS C. SENIUK  
 REBECCA B. SHULTS  
 GREGORY S. SICKELS  
 BRIAN E. SIEMIATKOWSKI  
 JARED L. SILVERMAN  
 RICHARD S. SLOCUM  
 JUSTIN C. SMITH  
 SCOTT R. STECHSCHULTE  
 ANNA E. STEEL  
 FRANK A. STROM III  
 DAVID W. STUTT  
 RACHEL A. STUTT  
 BRENDAN SULLIVAN  
 CONOR J. SULLIVAN  
 CHRISTOPHER E. SVENCER  
 COLLEEN A. SYMANSKY  
 NICOLE M. TESONIERO  
 MICHAEL C. THOMAS  
 JONATHAN T. TILLMAN  
 TRACEY L. TORBA  
 DONALD S. TROUTMAN  
 JESSICA A. TRUJILLO  
 HOWARD K. VACCO  
 GERALYN M. VAN DE KROL  
 ERIC J. VELEZ  
 OSVALDO E. VERA  
 ADOLFO E. VIEZCA  
 JOHN H. WALTERS  
 MATTHEW E. WARANIUS  
 CHRISTIANE D. WEBER  
 CHRISTOPHER C. WEISER  
 JONATHAN I. WELCH  
 KRISTA L. WELCH  
 GERARD M. WENK  
 JEFFREY D. WEST  
 TAMARA B. WHALEN  
 JUDSON B. WHEELER  
 BRADLY G. WINANS  
 ADAM R. WOLFE  
 DEWEY W. WORKER  
 RONNEY C. WRIGHT  
 JOSHUA L. ZIKE  
 JAMES R. ZOLL, JR.  
 ANDREW H. ZUCKERMAN

# Daily Digest

## Senate

### Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages S6049–S6302*

**Measures Introduced:** Twelve bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4800–4811, S.J. Res. 76, and S. Res. 747. **Page S6073**

#### Measures Reported:

S. 3287, to modify the governmentwide financial management plan, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–278)

S. 4204, to establish an Interagency Task Force to analyze preparedness for national pandemics, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–279)

H.R. 4713, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department of Homeland Security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–280)

**Page S6073**

#### Measures Considered:

**Protect Act:** Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4675, to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. **Pages S6051–52**

**Community Reinvestment Act Regulations Congressional Disapproval:** By 43 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 201), Senate did not agree to the motion to proceed to consideration of H.J. Res. 90, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to “Community Reinvestment Act Regulations”. **Pages S6052–58**

#### House Messages:

**Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act:** Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 178, to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities

inside and outside China, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto:

**Page S6050**

#### Withdrawn:

McConnell (for Tillis) Amendment No. 2673 (to Amendment No. 2652), to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act to prohibit pre-existing condition exclusions. **Page S6050**

#### Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 2652, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6050**

McConnell Amendment No. 2680 (to Amendment No. 2652), to improve the small business programs. **Pages S6050–51**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

A motion was entered to close further debate on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 2652 (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Wednesday, October 21, 2020.

**Page S6050**

**Newman Nomination—Agreement:** Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Michael Jay Newman, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

**Pages S6059, S6302**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at approximately 12 noon, on Tuesday, October 20, 2020.

**Page S6302**

**Messages from the House:** **Pages S6071–72**

**Measures Referred:** **Page S6072**

**Measures Placed on the Calendar:** **Page S6072**

**Measures Read the First Time:** **Page S6072**

**Enrolled Bills Presented:** **Page S6073**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S6073–75**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:**

**Pages S6075–S6298**

**Additional Statements:** Page S6071  
**Amendments Submitted:** Pages S6296–S6301  
**Record Votes:** Two record votes were taken today.  
 (Total—202) Pages S6075–58

**Recess:** Senate convened at 4:30 p.m., agreed to the motion to recess, and recessed at 7:04 p.m., until 12 noon on Tuesday, October 20, 2020. (For Senate's

program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6302.)

## Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

# House of Representatives

## Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, October 20, 2020.

## Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

## Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

## NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D903)

H.J. Res. 87, providing for the reappointment of Michael M. Lynton as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Signed on October 2, 2020. (Public Law 116–162)

H.J. Res. 88, providing for the appointment of Franklin D. Raines as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Signed on October 2, 2020. (Public Law 116–163)

H.R. 991, to extend certain provisions of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act until September 30, 2030. Signed on October 10, 2020. (Public Law 116–164)

S. 227, to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians. Signed on October 10, 2020. (Public Law 116–165)

S. 982, to increase intergovernmental coordination to identify and combat violent crime within Indian lands and of Indians. Signed on October 10, 2020. (Public Law 116–166)

S. 490, to designate a mountain ridge in the State of Montana as “B–47 Ridge”. Signed on October 13, 2020. (Public Law 116–167)

S. 1646, to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in St. Augustine, Florida, as the “Leo C. Chase Jr. Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic”. Signed on October 13, 2020. (Public Law 116–168)

S. 4072, to designate the clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Bend, Oregon, as the “Robert D. Maxwell Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic”. Signed on October 13, 2020. (Public Law 116–169)

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

### Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

### House

*Committee on Ways and Means*, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled “Maximizing Health Coverage Enrollment Amidst Administration Sabotage”, 12 p.m., Webex.

## CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of October 20 through October 23, 2020

### Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday*, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Michael Jay Newman, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

### Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation*: October 21, to hold hearings to examine passenger and freight rail, focusing on the current status of the rail network and the track ahead, 10 a.m., SR–253.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* October 22, business meeting to consider the nominations of Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Benjamin Joel Beaton, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, Kristi Haskins Johnson, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi, Taylor B. McNeel, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi, Kathryn Kimball Mizelle, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Thompson Michael Dietz, of New Jersey, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, S. 4632, to amend title 17, United States

Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to modify the scope of protection from civil liability for “good Samaritan” blocking and screening of offensive material, and an authorization for subpoenas relating to online content moderation, 9 a.m., SD–G50.

*Committee on Veterans’ Affairs:* October 21, to hold hearings to examine VA MISSION Act, focusing on assessing progress implementing Title I, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

#### House Committees

No hearings are scheduled.

*Next Meeting of the SENATE*

12 noon, Tuesday, October 20

*Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

9 a.m., Tuesday, October 20

## Senate Chamber

**Program for Tuesday:** Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Michael Jay Newman, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

## House Chamber

**Program for Tuesday:** House will meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m.



## Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at [www.govinfo.gov](http://www.govinfo.gov), free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, [contactcenter@gpo.gov](mailto:contactcenter@gpo.gov). ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov). Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.