United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2020 No. 181

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, October 23, 2020, at 11:30 a.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2020

(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.

Lord of Heaven's Army, we find our joy from trusting You. Today we are trusting Your promise to supply all our needs from Your celestial riches.

Lord, as we differ in faces, so we are different in our needs. Provide for the myriad needs of our Nation and world. Bring healing to the sick, comfort to those who grieve, and wisdom to those who seek to meet the challenges of a global health crisis.

Lord, give our lawmakers Your strength. We claim Your promise that You will not withhold any good thing from those who do what is right.

We pray in Your great 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 (Mrs. FISCHER). The President pro tempore.

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

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

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, what we have seen over the last week are attempts to get COVID relief up and Democrats won't let us bring it up, even though there is widespread agreement on the need for more COVID relief for families, for small businesses, for farms, for schools and colleges, and for additional funding for testing and vaccines. These are all noncontroversial items being held up by Democrat leaders' all-or-nothing negotiating position.

One controversial item they insist on is bailing out irresponsible State governments.

Iowa's years of sound governance and fiscal responsibility, including a rainy day fund that is full, has paid off in times like this. A study for the Council of State Governments ranked every State's ability to weather the economic impact of the pandemic. It found my State of Iowa to be fiscally sound—the most resilient State in the country.

In addition to the Council of State Governments, the CATO Institute ranked our Governor's fiscal policy second out of all 50 States. Other States haven't made the same tough decisions and weren't ready before the pandemic.

Now Democrats want Iowans' Federal tax money to bail out irresponsible State governments and somehow this is worth holding up relief for struggling families. Come on.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday evening the Directors of National Intelligence and the FBI updated the public on foreign efforts to influence our election and our government's work to prevent them. They announced that Iran and Russia exploited voter information to send misleading emails. This is just another reminder that multiple different adversaries with multiple different objectives want to fuel divisions among Americans and create chaos. Iran, China, Russia, and other adversaries may have different goals, but they all share the same primary objective of undermining America's confidence in our democracy, and they are thrilled when their disinformation causes us to point fingers at each other rather than at them.

The good news is that we have spent the last 4 years gearing up for this. Unlike the Obama-Biden administration, on whose watch even Democrats admit we were caught flatfooted, the Trump administration has worked overtime with Congress and other actors to get us ready.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

The White House has imposed harsh new sanctions on Russians who interfered in 2016. The Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security, and the intelligence community have led efforts to strengthen and coordinate our defenses. Here in the Senate, the Intelligence Committee spent years studying what went wrong in 2016 and published a 1,300-plus-page report with recommendations.

In the last 2 years alone, we passed more than $800 million to fund and support secure elections. The Iranian and Russian operations described last night are being combatted by the Federal Government in close coordination with State and local officials and the private sector. Details are being shared with Congress and the public, as appropriate.

This is precisely how the process should work. We are literally miles ahead of where we were.

Even the Washington Democrats who spent years talking up the threats to our election infrastructure are now admitting that we have made huge strides. Just a few days ago, the junior Senator for Connecticut admitted: ''We are going to have a free and fair election . . . because we have spent significant money from the Federal Government, and through States, to beef up protections of our voter lists and our voting systems.''

It is a separate question whether Democrats' ability to express basic patriotic confidence in our institutions should be so contingent on whether their preferred candidate seems to be up in the polls. But, regardless, that is the truth.

I will close with one point I keep making. The work of protecting our democracy is not just the job of experts and government buildings. This is also a duty that falls upon every one of us, every single citizen. At this point, it is a patriotic duty for Americans to be educated consumers of information.

Citizens who need information about voting should look to their local official sources, and all of us on all sides should take a deep breath and realize division, disinformation, and chaos are exactly what our adversaries want. We are all in this together. All of us Americans are in this together.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Madam President, this morning, the Judiciary Committee reported the nomination of Judge Amy Coney Barrett to the floor. Their recommendation was that she be confirmed. It was actually unanimous. As one CNN journalist stated last week, ''Let's be honest, in another [political] age . . . Judge Amy Coney Barrett would be getting 70 votes or more in the U.S. Senate because of her qualifications.''

It is supremely ironic that our Democratic colleagues delivered through a temper tantrum what they should have delivered through a fair appraisal: a unanimous endorsement. They, of course, were not there.

All last week, the legal brilliance and judicial temperament our Nation deserves in a Supreme Court Justice were on full display. We saw why legal peers, fellow scholars, nonpartisan evaluators, students, and clerks from across the political spectrum have praised this nominee in the very highest terms.

In just a few days, she will receive a vote on this floor. I anticipate we will have a new Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. That is exactly what the American people want to happen. Clear majorities of Americans want Judge Barrett confirmed. Of our fellow citizens who formed an opinion, roughly two out of three want confirmation.

The Democratic leader's histrionics are proving just as unpersuasive outside the Chamber as they have proven inside it. His anger and false statements failed to persuade the Senate and failed to persuade the American people. Day after day, our colleague from New York performs the same angry speech with the same falsehoods and forces a vote on some pointless impermissible motion.

The Democratic leader is just lashing out in random ways. A few weeks ago, he torpedoed a bipartisan counterintelligence briefing for no reason. This week, he blocked a pandemic rescue package and tried repeatedly to adjourn the Senate for multiple weeks.

Today, I understand he stood outside the Senate to shout that Democrats would be boycotting the committee vote, and the committee vote had already ended.

Look, I understand that some outside pressure groups have been badgering the Democratic leader to act more angry. I am just sorry for the Senate that he obeys them. I am sorry our colleague felt the need to publicly brag that he had scolded the senior Senator from California for being too civil. Scolding somebody for being too civil, one of our colleagues? It is not a good idea to be civil?

Really, I am sorry that he feels the need to constantly say things that are false. The American people know that we disagree. They do not expect ''kumbaya,'' but they deserve an adult discussion.

Let's review some facts. First, the timeline. The Democratic leader's claims this process has been rushed are simply false. Sixteen days passed between President Trump's announcement and the start of the hearings. In the last 60 years alone, eight Supreme Court confirmations moved faster. Only eight moved faster in the last 60 years. Then 1 week elapsed between the end of Judge Barrett's hearings and today's committee vote. Half of all the confirmations since 1916 have moved faster than that. Half of all the confirmations since 1916 have moved faster than that.

Justice John Paul Stevens was confirmed in 19 days from start to finish. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor took just over a month. Chief Justice John Marshall was confirmed in 1 week after John Adams already lost reelection. John Adams appointed Chief Justice John Marshall after he had already lost the election. President Lincoln got someone confirmed in 1 day.

Obviously, it is completely false to say that this has been anywhere close to the fastest process ever. It is just disinformation.

Here is another nonsense claim: that Judge Barrett is somehow the most partisan or politicalized nominee ever. Really? Andrew Jackson nominated a political operative to the Court at the end of his Presidency. Lincoln put his own campaign manager on the Court. Eisenhower nominated Earl Warren after Warren had stopped competing with him in the 1952 election and campaigned for him.

But this professor from Indiana who got multiple Democratic votes for confirmation to her current job just 3 years ago is going to be the most political confirmation ever? In the previous century, they put their campaign chairman on the Supreme Court. That is pretty political. Eisenhower put the Governor of California who ran against him for the nomination on the Court. That is pretty political.

I will give you an example.

The great John Marshall Harlan, from Kentucky, had a partner who was a Cabinet member in the Grant administration—a guy named Benjamin Bristow. Bristow was sort of thought of as ''Mr. Clean'' in the Grant administration, which had a lot of scandal problems. The GOP convention in 1876 was going to be in Cincinnati. In those days, of course, if you wanted to be President, you couldn't admit it. You sort of had to act like you were being drafted. So John Marshall Harlan, the largely unknown partner of the better known Benjamin Bristow, went to Cincinnati, to the GOP convention, to get his law partner, Mr. Clean, the nomination—the perfect choice after 8 years of scandal in the Grant administration.

It became clear after a few rounds of voting that he wasn't going to be able to pull it off for his partner, Benjamin Bristow, so Harlan threw Bristow's votes to the Governor of Ohio, Rutherford B. Hayes. Amazingly enough, right after President Hayes was sworn in in March of 1877, it was John Marshall Harlan, not Benjamin Bristow, who ended up on the Supreme Court.

He served for 30 years with great distinction and was the sole dissenter in Plessy v. Ferguson. He was the one Member of the Court in 1896 who got it right with regard to desegregation and public accommodations. That actually became the majority opinion 58 years later in Brown v. Board of Education.

Talk about a political appointment. That was a political appointment. Amy Coney Barrett is not the most political appointment ever to the Supreme Court by any objective standard. So these are not really arguments. They are just kind of angry noises.

The Democratic leader said: ''Abraham Lincoln, when [he] had the opportunity to fill a Supreme Court seat,

said it would be unfair to do it so close to an election.''

That is not true. It never happened. President Lincoln never said that nor did he do that. The Washington Post already debunked this disinformation when another Democratic Senator tried to spread it.

Now the Democratic leader is claiming Chairman GRAHAM did something unprecedented in committee this morning. That would be news to Senator LEAHY, who had a Democratic majority vote multiple judges to the floor in 2014 when there were not two Republicans present. Chairmen of both parties have done the same thing multiple times.

The Democratic leader continues to misstate what the Republicans said in 2016. Let me quote verbatim from my very first floor speech after Justice Scalia passed away. Here is what I said: ''The Senate has not filled a vacancy arising in an election year when there was divided government since 1888.'' That is what we had then, a divided government—a Republican Senate and a Democratic President. Now, my friend the Democratic leader may be emotionally invested in this idea that I said something else, but that is, in fact, what I said. Historical precedent supported no confirmation in 2016, and it supports confirming Judge Barrett now.

Look, everybody knows what is going on here. We know why the Democratic leader feels this need to keep saying things that aren't true. Our colleague is trying to invent a justification to declare war on judicial independence and pack the Supreme Court if the Democrats should win power. That is what this is all about.

Back in March, he walked across the street and threatened Justices by name if they ruled against his wishes, and now, even though this Court ended up delighting the political left with several decisions this very year, he still wants an excuse to pack the Court.

The American people know what a terrible idea this is. Polls show majority support for confirming Judge Barrett and overwhelming opposition to court-packing. The American people are glad that Franklin Roosevelt didn't get to blow up our independent judiciary in 1937, and they strongly oppose Democratic threats now.

The Democratic leader may support court-packing, and former Vice President Biden may call it a ''live ball,'' but the American people know these threats are anathema to the rule of law.

This Senate majority will not let falsehoods drown out facts. We will not reward hostage-taking, and we will not be bullied out of doing what is right. We are going to follow history and precedent and do our job.

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

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

RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, throughout my tenure in the Senate, I have been a leader in promoting renewable energy sources, like being called the father of the wind energy tax credit. This has led to a cleaner environment and has increased America's energy independence.

It is concerning to see legislation from progressive Members of Congress that would eliminate internal combustion engine vehicles like the vast majority of us drives and depends on. In other words, we will all have to buy electric cars. This is supposed to help the environment, but, remember, most electrical generation is from fossil fuels.

There are more practical solutions available. Currently, renewable fuels can reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 43 percent, but they would be totally eliminated under this extreme bill. By adding more ethanol and biodiesel to our energy mix, we can reduce emissions while still keeping transportation costs low for working families.

I ask my colleagues across the aisle to abandon this radical scheme. If they want a cleaner environment, then they should look to renewable fuels produced in our Nation's heartland.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, before I get into the substance of my remarks, I will briefly redress the Republican leader.

He came on the floor and, with his typical vitriol, made all kinds of accusations. The bottom line is MCCONNELL is angry. Why? Because we Democrats have exposed that he has defiled the Senate as an institution more than any person in this generation and many generations, because we Democrats have exposed the hypocrisy of holding up Merrick Garland because it was 8 months before an election and rushing through Amy Coney Barrett because it is ''something we can do.''

The bottom line is Leader MCCONNELL, of course, doesn't like hearing these things, but they are the truth, and they will live on in history. The man who defiled the Senate, the man who created one of the greatest hypocritical acts in the history of the Senate, sits in that chair.

Now, the Republican majority is steering the Senate toward one of the lowest moments in its long history, and the damage it does to this Chamber may very well be irrevocable.

After thwarting the constitutional prerogative of a duly elected Democratic President to appoint a Supreme Court Justice because it was an election year, the Republican majority is rushing to confirm a Justice for a Republican President 1 week—1 week—before election day.

Four short years ago, all of our Republican friends argued that it was principle—that is the world they used, ''principle''—to let the American people have a voice in the selection of a Supreme Court Justice because an election was 8 months away.

Those same Republicans are preparing to confirm a Justice with an election that is 8 days away. What a stench of hypocrisy.

In the process, the majority has trampled over every norm, rule, or standard that could possibly stand in its way. It ignored health guidelines to conduct in-person hearings in the middle of a pandemic after Republicans Members of the committee themselves had contracted COVID.

It has broken longstanding Senate precedent. Never in the history of the Senate has a Supreme Court nominee—a lifetime appointment—been considered so close to an election. The Presiding Officer of the Senate confirmed this yesterday in response to this Senator's inquiry. Never in the history of the Senate has a Supreme Court nominee been confirmed after July of an election year.

Before even we arrived at this sordid chapter, the Republican majority broke the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate, lowering the number of votes required for a Supreme Court nomination so that Republicans could confirm whomever they wanted.

They changed the rules of the Senate again to limit the amount of time the Senate spends considering judicial nominations so they could pack the courts with their rightwing appointees even faster.

It is a hallmark of democracy that might does not make right, but the Republicans are blatantly ignoring this principle. Here, in Leader MCCONNELL's Senate, the majority lives by the rule of ''because we can.'' They completely ignore the question of whether they should. Morality, principles, value, consistency are all out the window.

Here, now, we have the culmination of this Republican majority's systemic erosion of rules and norms in pursuit of raw political power: a Supreme Court nominee who will be confirmed on a party-line vote after the rules were changed to allow it, in complete contradiction to the supposed principle

that the same party so vehemently argued only 4 years ago, 8 days before an election in which the American people will choose exactly whom they want to pick Supreme Court Justices for them.

This idea that because now the Presidency and the Senate are in one party, the rule doesn't apply—they never said that when they blocked Merrick Garland. It is fakery. It is, again, part of the house of lies that is being built by the majority to rush a Supreme Court Justice like this.

It is absurd. It is outrageous. It is a stain on this body and an indelible mark on this Senate majority that will live in history. The Senate Republican majority is conducting the most rushed, most partisan, and least legitimate process in the long history of Supreme Court nominations, and Democrats will not lend an ounce of legitimacy to that process.

Today the members of the minority on the Judiciary Committee have boycotted the markup of Amy Coney Barrett. The rules of the Judiciary Committee require that two members of the minority be present in order to conduct a markup.

True to form, Chairman GRAHAM decided to break the rules to move forward with a vote on Judge Barrett anyway—steamrolling over the rules of the Judiciary Committee, just like Republicans have steamrolled over principle, honesty, fairness, consistency, and decency in their mad rush to confirm a Justice before the election. To steamroll over rules—that is the mark of an autocratic society, not the mark of a democracy, and the Republican majority is going along with that kind of autocracy, the same kind exhibited by President Trump. It is a shame that the principles of the Republican Party are out the window.

Today, the Democratic seats on the dais in that committee room remained empty. In their place were reminders of what is ultimately at stake in this nomination—the fundamental rights of the American people. In their place were photographs of Americans whose lives would be devastated if Judge Barrett delivers the decisive vote to strike down the Affordable Care Act, ripping away healthcare from tens of millions of Americans and eliminating protections for 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

You could imagine, alongside their faces, the faces of women who cherish the right to make their own private medical decisions; the faces of LGBTQ Americans who want to marry whom they love and not be fired for who they are; the faces of American workers who are breaking their backs to make ends meet, who need their union to help them get a better wage; the faces of young people who know the planet is in peril in their lifetimes.

I hope that when Republican members of the committee took their seats this morning, they looked at those faces. They ought to think about what this nomination means for them. I hope they actually took one moment to think about what it says about their sham of a process that Democrats were forced to take the extraordinary step of refusing to participate.

While they may realize it or not—or they may not even care—the Republican majority's monomaniacal drive to confirm this Justice in the most hypocritical of circumstances will forever defile the Senate and curtail the fundamental rights of American people for generations to come.

To every one of my colleagues: History will remember what you have done. Democrats will play no part in it.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION—MOTION TO PROCEED

Madam President, while the Senate majority rushes to confirm the Supreme Court Justice, it is ignoring a number of very important priorities.

Earlier this week, the Republicans had a series of stunt votes on COVID relief on an emaciated bill that left most Americans behind and that was even designated to fail.

Now I want to mention a foreign policy issue the Republican majority is ignoring. We have a resolution by Senators MENENDEZ and MURPHY to invoke statutory authority under the Foreign Assistance Act to require the Secretary of State to assess and report to the Congress on Turkey's potential human rights abuses in Syria.

My colleagues introduced this resolution as a result of Turkey's invasion of northeast Syria and its campaign to ethnically cleanse Kurds from the region, which has resulted in numerous reports of horrific human rights abuses.

The tragic events were the result of the President's decision to abandon our Kurdish partners. The administration didn't lift a finger to uncover the atrocities committed by Turkish proxies.

Even more recently, the Turkish Government, led by President Erdogan, has blood on his hands for his role in the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

President Erdogan is sending individuals responsible for the atrocities in Syria to this region now. He must be exposed—he must be exposed—for these actions. This President has a record of cozying up to dictators, and action must be taken.

So in order to proceed to S. Res. 409, a resolution requesting information on Turkey's human rights practices in Syria, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to proceed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at 12:59 today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, Amy Coney Barrett's first Judiciary Committee hearing back in 2017 has become infamous for the grilling she underwent for her religion.

Then, as now, she was an outstanding choice who received a rating of ''well qualified'' from the American Bar Association and praise from peers on both sides of the political spectrum.

But despite her superb qualifications, it soon became clear that more than one Democrat thought she couldn't be objective and thus shouldn't be confirmed to the court simply because she was a practicing Catholic who took her faith seriously.

''The dogma lives loudly within you,'' the Democratic ranking member on the Judiciary Committee said, ''and that is of concern.''

''Do you consider yourself an orthodox Catholic?'' the Democratic whip asked, while the junior Senator from Hawaii suggested that Judge Barrett would use her Catholic faith rather than the law to decide questions.

And while Democrats toned down the anti-religious questioning in Judge Barrett's Supreme Court hearing last week, apparently realizing that openly displaying their suspicion of her religion might offend the tens of millions of American voters who take their faith seriously, their suspicion of her faith has still been on display.

Meanwhile, Democrats' media allies haven't hesitated to trot out articles on Judge Barrett's beliefs, usually with the faint—or in some cases not so faint—suggestion that her adherence to the teachings of the Catholic Church cast doubt on her fitness for the Supreme Court.

Yesterday's AP article on the fact that Judge Barrett served as a trustee at her children's Christian school—not exactly breaking news, as it was something that Judge Barrett had already disclosed—was just one more example of the media's implicit suggestion that the nominee's religion makes her unfit for public office.

As a side note, I am still waiting for bipartisan condemnation of media coverage of Judge Barrett's adopted children. Somehow the New York Times felt that Judge Barrett's brief mentions of her adopted children at her introduction and hearing warranted an article full of unsavory insinuations. I am wondering if Democrats would have found this appropriate coverage of a Democratic nominee's children.

From the attitude displayed by Democrats and the media, you would think that Judge Barrett was a member of some remote and bizarre religious cult instead of one of the largest faith groups in the world.

And Judge Barrett has not been the only judicial nominee subjected to

scrutiny for her faith. The Democrats' Vice Presidential candidate grilled one judicial nominee on his membership in the Knights of Columbus, a Catholic charitable organization known for dangerous activities like selling Christmas trees and providing coats for kids in need and partnering with other dangerous charities like Habitat for Humanity and Special Olympics.

Nor is this kind of suspicion of practicing Catholics and other Christians limited to the judicial realm. Democrats' suspicion of religious court nominees is just one feature of the left's growing hostility to religion generally.

More and more, Democrats and liberals are telling religious Americans that they should close their mouths and restrict their religion to the privacy of their homes.

In September, the former Democratic Presidential candidate, Hillary Clinton, suggested that Christianity has become ''judgmental'' and ''alienating.''

One of the current Democratic Presidential candidate's staffers recently said that she doesn't think orthodox Catholics, Muslims, or Jews should sit on the Supreme Court.

The current Vice Presidential candidate introduced legislation in this Congress to weaken the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, a key law intended to protect Americans' right to live out their religion.

And forget religious liberty under a Democratic administration. The Democratic Presidential candidate has publicly announced that if he becomes President, he intends to go after the Little Sisters of the Poor—an order of nuns who spend their lives caring for the elderly poor—to force them—to force them—to offer a health insurance provision that violates their religious faith.

That is right. The Democrats' Presidential candidate has proudly announced that his administration will do the heroic work of pursuing a group of nuns who serve the poor to ensure that they are not allowed to fully live out their religious beliefs.

Where to start? Perhaps I should start by noting what should be obvious—that hostility to religion is fundamentally un-American. America was founded on religious liberty. Long before the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution was signed, people came to these shores seeking the right to practice their religion in freedom, and that concern for religious liberty continued through the founding.

Religious freedom was regarded as so fundamental that it is the very first freedom mentioned in the Bill of Rights. ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion,'' the Bill of Rights begins, ''or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.''

Now, some have interpreted references to religion in the Constitution to somehow mean that the Founders were looking to preference secularism over religion and exclude religion from the public square. Nothing could be further from the truth. Far from wanting to diminish the place of religion or exclude it from public life, the Founders saw religion as something to be fostered. In fact, religion was widely regarded as an essential ingredient in producing good citizens—the kinds of citizens who could maintain the republican government the Constitution had created.

To quote George Washington:

> Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity.

Democrats would like to reduce freedom of religion to a grudging toleration and religious people to second-class citizens. That is not what religious freedom has meant in America. In America, religious freedom has always been a robust freedom—permission to live out your faith not just in the confines of your home but in the public square.

I find it the height of irony that critiques of religious people like Amy Coney Barrett focus on the supposed dogmatism or intolerance of religious individuals because there are few people as dogmatic and intolerant as members of the left wing in America.

Remember when the Women's March was founded at the start of the current administration? More than one pro-life group wanted to join the march and stand for women's rights, but they were quickly kicked off the march's list of partners because the grand poohbahs of the pro-abortion left have decided that you can't stand for the dignity of both mother and child and still be a feminist.

It is pretty much the same in the Democratic Party. While a few pro-life Democrats are tolerated in spots where Democrats might not otherwise win, the pro-life Democrat is on the way to extinction at the party level. Last year, for example, the Democratic Attorneys General Association announced that it would not endorse or finance candidates who do not support abortion. So I find it the height of irony when Democrats complain about the supposed dogmatism of religious individuals.

Do Democrats evince the same concerns about dogmatism when avidly pro-abortion or avidly secular individuals are nominated to the Federal bench, or do they assume that these individuals can set aside their beliefs and rule fairly in cases involving abortion or religion? I am pretty sure they assume these individuals will be able to rule fairly according to the law. Yet they deny this respect to religious individuals. Instead, Democrats offer the demeaning and insulting suggestion that religious people alone are incapable of setting aside their personal beliefs.

I would like to see the attacks on Judge Amy Coney Barrett's faith stop, but more than that, I would like to see the Democratic Party return to a deeper respect for religion and the central place of a robust religious freedom in American life. I would like to be confident that future nominees will not face the suggestion that their faith should prohibit them from participation in the public sphere.

President Obama once spoke of working-class Americans as bitter individuals who cling to their religion. Needless to say, he didn't mean it in a positive way, but he should have. Many great Americans have clung to their religion and been inspired by it to do great things, from serving the needy to fighting for the oppressed. America has been made better by individuals who cling to their faith.

I look forward to seeing the great things that are to come from religious Americans serving in the public square, and we can start by confirming the eminently qualified Amy Coney Barrett to the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Constitution of the United States makes three references to religion. The First Amendment to the Bill of Rights says that we have the right to believe or not believe as a matter of personal conscience and, secondly, that there will be no established government religion in the United States. The only other provision is in article VI, where it expressly says there will be no religious test for public office—three simple assertions which for over 200 years have guided this Nation in dealing with religion.

The statement just made by the Senator from South Dakota really tells me that he didn't tune in to the hearings that were held just a week or two ago when it came to Amy Coney Barrett. I did. I was there for all 4 days, start to finish, with maybe 10 minutes that I stepped aside. So I know what was said and who said it, and I know what the Democrats said, and I didn't believe there was one instance—not one—where any Democrat raised the issue of this nominee's religion. We took seriously what article VI says in the Constitution: There is no religious test for office.

I will state that on the other side of the aisle, there were frequent references to her religion—express references to her religion. That is their right as Senators to decide how they want to handle this issue. But the suggestion that I heard from the Senator from South Dakota tells me he did not follow the hearing and he didn't listen to it. Had he done so, he wouldn't have made the statements that he just did on the floor.

As a lifelong Catholic, I want to state that I have voted for Catholics to serve

on every court, both the Supreme Court and other courts in the land, and I have voted against some as well. I take the admonition of the Constitution seriously. I don't take a person's religion into account when I cast a vote when it comes to a judge, nor should anyone if they follow this Constitution.

One last point I would like to make that was clearly wrong: When it came to the scurrilous and disgusting attacks on the adopted children of this nominee, the Senator from Louisiana spoke up against them, and so did I on the Democratic side. They are unacceptable on either side of the aisle, and for any Senators to suggest otherwise tells me he did not listen to the hearing itself.

I condemn the attack on her family, and I repeat that condemnation on the floor of the Senate today. For that Senator to ignore that fact troubles me greatly. I count him as a friend. I hope when he reads the record of the actual proceedings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he will come and clarify and correct his remarks.

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, the last point I want to make—and I know we have a vote in a few minutes—is this: If you ask the American people ''What is the business of the Senate for the next 5 days?'' I don't think anyone, if they follow it closely, would ever guess the business that we are about.

We live in a country now where 222,000 people have died from this COVID–19 pandemic—222,000. Eight million have been affected. A country that represents 4.5 percent of the world's population, the United States counts for 20 percent of all the COVID–19 deaths in the world. Sadly, it is getting worse before it gets better.

In the State of Illinois, the Governor announced yesterday that because of the increased incidence of infection from COVID–19 in the four major counties surrounding the city of Chicago, we have to close down restaurants and other establishments. It is heartbreaking. I know what it means to these business owners. But it is also heartbreaking to read the numbers day in and day out of what this COVID–19 virus is doing in America—not just to the poor hapless souls who are infected and some dying but to the economy of this country.

Wouldn't you think that would be the focus of business on the floor of the U.S. Senate? Wouldn't you think that the Senate majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL from Kentucky, who controls the business of the floor, would make that job one for all of us and stick together on a bipartisan basis to come up with an agreement before we did anything else? Well if you guessed that, you are wrong, because for the next 5 days, we will be consumed with filling one Supreme Court vacancy. He is determined to fill that vacancy at any cost, including ignoring the major issue of our time, the major issue of the moment—the pandemic, which affects this country so gravely.

We have lost 222,000 souls, sadly, in America, and it is estimated that it may reach half a million by January 1. What a heartbreak. And we are here spending 5 straight days not dealing with COVID–19 relief, not providing the testing that is needed, not providing unemployment benefits to those who lost jobs, not providing help to small businesses—no. We are focused on one nomination for one vacancy in the Supreme Court. As important as that may be in the ordinary scheme of things, we are not in the ordinary scheme of things. We are dealing with an extraordinary pandemic, which is causing grave damage to this country, to its families, and to our economy. The President may not take it seriously. Obviously the Senate Republicans don't take it seriously. If they did, they would be engaged.

I cannot explain or even imagine how he explains why Senator MCCONNELL refuses to sit down for the negotiations for COVID–19 relief. That is right. They have had negotiations that have involved Senator SCHUMER, Speaker PELOSI, Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, and the President's Chief of Staff, and Senator MCCONNELL refuses to attend those negotiations where they are trying to come up with a bipartisan measure to help us through this crisis. All he does is offer throwaway votes on the floor, take-it-or-leave-it votes on the floor that don't have any bipartisan route to them. They come to us because he wants to have a symbolic rollcall—a symbolic rollcall—for his Members to take home and say: Well, I tried.

No, you didn't try.

If for 5 straight days we do nothing about COVID–19 and focus exclusively on this nominee, how in the world will any Senator explain that was the American priority of the moment? It is not. The American priority of the moment is not this vacancy on the Supreme Court; it is the fact that there are vacancies in homes across America from 222,000 deaths in this country, and they continue apace every single day.

We ought to be coming together on a bipartisan basis. The person who should be leading us in the Senate is the Senate Republican leader. He does not, and as a consequence, we waste our moments here when they should be spent helping America with its highest priority.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to legislative session.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Ex.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—51

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

NOT VOTING—4

Harris	Rubio
Jones	Sinema

The motion was rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the 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. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Michael Jay Newman, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), 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 66, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 Ex.]

YEAS—66

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

NAYS—31

Baldwin	Heinrich	Schatz
Bennet	Hirono	Schumer
Blumenthal	King	Smith
Booker	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—3

Harris	Jones	Sinema

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 31.

The motion is agreed to.

The Democratic leader.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this morning, the Judiciary Committee voted Amy Coney Barrett out in violation of its rules. The rules of the Judiciary Committee say, before you can vote a nominee to the floor, there must be two members of the minority. That has been obeyed by Democrats and Republicans for a very long time. I remember it in existence for all of the years I was on the Judiciary. Yet, typical of this Republican majority, when there were not two Democrats there, they just steamrolled the nominee through in violation of the rules. That has been typical. This whole thing has been a steamroller operation of one of the most important appointments we can all make—weeks before a Presidential election—of a nominee whose views, in the judgment of most Americans, are far away on healthcare, on reproductive rights, on labor unions, and on guns from where the average American is.

It is a steamroller, and this was in violation of the rules, which is not surprising given this rush to judgment—given this maniacal desire to get this nominee through before Americans vote. It is in violation of the rules.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I make a point of order that the Barrett nomination should not be placed on the Executive Calendar because it was reported in violation of the rules of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination was reported in accordance with the Standing Rules of the Senate. The point of order is not sustained.

APPEAL RULING OF THE CHAIR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I appeal the ruling of the Chair and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The question is on the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wants to be clear about the question before the body.

The question is, On the appeal of the ruling of the Chair, shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), 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 yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—3

Harris	Jones	Sinema

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, and the nays are 44.

The Senate sustains the decision of the Chair.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I spent some one-on-one time yesterday with Amy Coney Barrett. I had the opportunity to be able to ask her questions about agency deference, about religious liberty, and about the responsibility of the three branches of government and the separation of those. We spent time talking about antitrust laws, Tribal laws, and all sorts of things to walk through some things that were not covered in the hearing time.

I walked away even more impressed with her as a leader, her knowledge, her judicial temperament, her sense of responsibility, the awe that she is taking on this responsibility that the Nation would ask her to do.

It stands in stark contrast to some of the conversations I have had with some of my colleagues on the other side and from the hearings over the last week where, most of the time, my colleagues spent their time saying that people should be afraid of this mother of seven, that she is a terrifying individual who will take away your healthcare, who will take away your right to be able to destroy your unborn child if you choose to, that she is racist and that she is anti-woman, which I thought were the ultimate challenges to her as a woman herself, obviously, and when she was challenged over and over again about being a racist and a segregationist. She is the mother of a multiracial family.

It is a bizarre side-by-side to actually meet the actual person and to go through the law versus hearing the descriptions.

Amy Coney Barrett is a native of New Orleans, LA. She is the daughter of a lawyer and a teacher, the oldest of seven children. She has been married to her husband Jesse for 21 years. She herself is the mother of seven children, as I mentioned before—Emma, Vivian, Tess, John Peter, Liam, Juliet, and Benjamin. We got to watch them sitting behind her, quietly watching, proudly, their mom.

She graduated summa cum laude from Notre Dame Law School. After graduating from law school, she clerked for DC Circuit Judge Laurence Silberman and for Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia. She was challenged over and over again, with people saying: You are just like Scalia. She kept responding very calmly to people: ''I have my own mind.'' She practiced both trial and appellate litigation.

Judge Barrett also worked for more than 15 years in academia. She was a distinguished legal scholar at the Notre Dame Law School, the University of Virginia School of Law, and George Washington University Law School. She published articles in the

Columbia, Virginia, Texas, and Cornell law reviews. Three graduating classes at Notre Dame Law have selected Judge Barrett as the Distinguished Professor of the Year.

In 2017, she was nominated by President Trump to serve on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals and was confirmed by this Senate with a bipartisan vote. Judge Barrett's colleagues at Notre Dame signed a letter supporting her 2017 nomination, calling her ''a model of the fair, impartial and sympathetic judge.'' Since joining the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in 2017, Judge Barrett has participated in over 600 cases.

The ABA Standing Committee issued Judge Barrett a ''well qualified'' rating based on ''the qualities of integrity, professional competence, and judicial temperament.''

When confirmed, Justice Barrett will be the fifth woman to serve on the Supreme Court in its history. She will be the first mother of school-age children to serve on the Court. She will be the only sitting member of the Court to have graduated from a law school other than Harvard or Yale. She will also be the second sitting member of the Court to have been born in the South and only the second member in the Court's history to have been born in Louisiana. She will be the only sitting member of the Court to have served on the Seventh Circuit, which hears cases arising out of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

During the Judiciary Committee hearings, we heard testimony from Laura Wolk, a former student of Judge Barrett's. It was remarkable testimony.

She said, in part:

> [S]hould you confirm Amy Barrett, the country will receive something far greater than simply an unparalleled legal mind. The Supreme Court—and therefore all Americans—will gain the service of one of the kindest individuals I have ever known. Her brilliance is matched only by her compassion, and her honesty is beyond reproach.
>
> I do not speak in mere abstractions. Rather, I have experienced these characteristics firsthand, with life-changing results. . . . Judge Barrett described a mentor who gave her a treasured book of literature to commemorate their relationship. Judge Barrett has now passed that torch onto me, giving me a gift of immeasurable value: the ability to pursue an abundant life with the potential to break down barriers so that I can leave this world a better place than I found it.

I could not agree more with her or with her colleagues and peers about her superb qualifications and preparedness to serve in this role. As an originalist and a textualist, her commitment to both the role of the Court and the rule of law are clear. To read her opinions from the perspective of the losing party demonstrates her fairness, her empathy, and her temperament as a judge.

Beyond her resume and accolades, her character, her commitment to faith and family, and her service to her students and the community should not go overlooked. Judge Barrett has my unqualified, full support, and I look forward to voting for her nomination in the next few days.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1060

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, every day we see more Americans dying from COVID–19 and more Americans contracting this virus. As of today, we have hit the awful mark of over 220,000 Americans dead from COVID–19, the highest death level in the entire world, and, with that, we are also experiencing the economic fallout and pain that has come with it.

It did not have to be this way. President Trump knew about this deadly virus early on, and he could have and should have acted. But even at this moment, there are things that this U.S. Senate can be doing to both stop the spread of the virus and ease the economic pain. We could be taking up and voting on the legislation that passed the House of Representatives called the Heroes Act, which is a comprehensive emergency relief package for the American people—both addressing testing and contact tracing and other issues to stop the spread of the virus and providing essential economic relief to American families, workers, and businesses that are struggling from the fallout.

But we haven't even had a chance to vote on that bill here in the U.S. Senate. The Heroes Act was passed by the House more than 5 months ago, and then, recently, the House passed a revised version called Heroes 2.0. We tried to get a vote on that just this past Tuesday here in the U.S. Senate. It was blocked by the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and here we have 12 days to go until the election. Instead of focusing on that relief, we are trying to rush through and use an illegitimate process to put another Justice on the Court.

But there is something else that we should also be doing now instead of rushing a Justice on the Court, in addition to the Heroes Act, and that is defending the integrity of our democratic process and the integrity of our elections.

That is what brings me to the floor today because we have, of course, a few days to go—12 days, to be exact—to get to the election. Yet it has been years—not just 1 year, not just 2 years, not just 3 years—years when some of us have been pushing to enact legislation here to defend against foreign interference in our elections—Russian interference, which we have known about since 2016, and interference from other adversaries.

So, yesterday, we heard from the Director of National Intelligence that there are foreign actors interfering in our elections and attempting to disrupt our process—Russia and Iran. Well, the question for the U.S. Senate is not the issue of whether we were going to have foreign interference. The question for the U.S. Senate is, Why did we sit back and do nothing about it for 3 years—for 3 years?

Senator RUBIO and I introduced a bipartisan bill. It is called the DETER Act, which is very straightforward. It says that if we catch Russia and Putin interfering in our elections again, there will be automatic, swift sanctions, so if you are Vladimir Putin and you are thinking about interfering in our elections, you will know there will be a certain price to pay. Right now, it is cost-free to the Russians and cost-free to other adversaries.

Our bill called for the executive branch to put together a plan to respond and establish upfront penalties not just for Russian interference but for interference from any adversary. That is the way you deter interference in the first place. You can't stop interference if there is no cost to be borne by the adversary seeking to disrupt your process. That is pretty simple.

We have used the idea and concept of deterrence in many other cases to try to keep the peace. Yet, here we are, talking about safeguarding our democracy by putting in place a very simple mechanism to say to anyone who wants to undermine faith in the democratic process or support a particular candidate—as Russia did in 2016 and as they have worked to do over the last couple of years in favor of President Trump—to put in place a process where they know if they get caught, they will be punished, and I don't mean punishing a few oligarchs. I am not talking about punishing a few bureaucrats who may be responsible for actually doing the disruption, but creating penalties on the Russian economy—the banking sector, the energy sector—because we all know that you don't have Russian bureaucrats and intelligence officials interfere in our elections without the green light from the very top, and that is true of other adversaries who seek to interfere in our elections.

So the real question is, Why do we continue to see stonewalling on this simple legislation? Why does the Trump administration continue to oppose it? And why doesn't the Senate do its job as an independent body, supposedly, to protect the integrity of our elections?

Here is what President Trump said just a few years ago in Helsinki when he was side by side with President Putin. President Trump said:

> My people came to me—Dan Coats came to me and some others—they said they think it's Russia. I have President Putin; he just said it's not Russia.
>
> I will say this: I don't see any reason why it would be. . . . I have confidence in both parties.

Then he went on to say:

> I have great confidence in my intelligence people, but I will tell you that President Putin was extremely strong and powerful in his denial today.

This was years ago, yet we hear from our intelligence officials that Russia is still interfering. We heard that just yesterday and that other adversaries are interfering.

But the Trump administration didn't want to do a damn thing about it, and, unfortunately, this body has been complicit in doing nothing—doing nothing—to seriously protect the integrity of our elections. We have to keep asking ourselves the question why we would leave ourselves defenseless. The only thing you can keep going back to are these continuing statements by President Trump talking about how he respects his friendship with Vladimir Putin and President Trump's actions time and again favoring the Russian position.

We have a last-minute opportunity here. There are 12 days to go before our election. Let us, finally, in light of the information we got yesterday and the information we have gotten on a monthly basis, let us, as the U.S. Senate, at least say today: If we catch you, Russia, if we catch you, Iran, we don't care who you are, if you are an adversary interfering in our elections, there will be a price to pay.

That was a bipartisan idea more than 2 years ago. We still get a lot of lip-service in favor of it here on a bipartisan basis. But when it comes to actually doing something about it and holding a vote, time and again we are denied that opportunity.

What is interesting is when this issue came up just last year as part of the national defense authorization bill, we had a motion on this floor to instruct the conferees from the House and the Senate that as part of the Defense authorization bill, we thought it was important to also protect our democracy from interference. We said that you should include a provision like the DETER Act. But as soon as that got behind closed doors, there was a furious effort by the Republican Senate leader and the Trump administration to prevent that from happening. I had numerous conversations with my colleague from the House side, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and it was opposed by the administration and opposed by the Republican Senate.

So here we are. Nobody should be surprised by what we heard yesterday. The surprise for the American people has got to be: Why the hell didn't we do anything about this for 3 years? We brought everybody together after 2016. I remember we lined up all the intelligence officials, including recent appointees by President Trump, and they all told us what had happened in 2016. Everybody said we are going to work really hard to stop it from happening in 2020. Yet one thing that we could do to make it clear upfront that there would be a price to pay, we have not done. Shame on the U.S. Senate for not moving forward.

There are 12 days left. The clock is ticking. Let's finally take action so at least our adversaries will know that there will be a price to pay if they continue in these final 12 days to try to interfere in our election process.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1060, the DETER Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this morning the Senate Judiciary Committee reported out Judge Amy Coney Barrett's nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court. I was proud to vote for her in committee.

Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to boycott the executive session. In addition, each day, the Democratic leader has attempted to adjourn the Senate.

They say that the Senate should not be working on the nomination of Amy Coney Barrett, and that it is delaying work on COVID relief. Now we hear today that we are delaying work and not even engaging in any response to the election interference that we knew 4 years ago occurred and which, as my colleague said, nobody should be surprised that we heard again that there are efforts on election interference by Russia, by Iran, and others.

Yesterday, there were three different live unanimous consent requests like this to bypass committees and immediately pass legislation without debate or amendments. These motions to adjourn and take-it-or-leave-it requests are a fight over the Senate floor schedule rather than building the necessary bipartisan support to pass needed legislation.

We are told that we haven't done anything for 4 years, turning to focus specifically on the question of election interference. The reality is that we have already signed into law the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act—or CAATSA—the BRINK Act; the Hong Kong Autonomy Act that substantially expanded sanctions on Russia, North Korea, and China; and the White House, in addition, has taken steps to use its IEEPA authority to impose additional targeted sanctions on those who attempted to interfere in the U.S. election.

We are told we aren't doing anything to work on the COVID relief package. My colleague from Maryland mentioned that they tried to pass the Heroes Act here in the Senate through a similar tactic that we are seeing today with regard to the DETER Act. What he didn't point out was that twice we have tried to bring forward a $500 billion COVID relief package on the floor of this Senate only to have the effort to even move to the bill rejected by our colleagues on the other side. And we tried to bring forward the PPP Act just 2 days ago, only to have that act stopped by our colleagues on the other side of the Senate who now tell us that we aren't trying to pass legislation to help deal with COVID relief.

The reality is that we won't accept—without debate or amendment—their take-it-or-leave-it proposals, and we need to get a bill on the floor to start dealing with these things.

Let's go back to election interference because I found it just remarkable that the claim is made that when we passed major legislation—with over 90 Senators on this floor voting for it—that put specific sanction authority and sanctions on Russia for election interference, for its aggression in Crimea, and for its other aggressive behavior around the globe—particularly its cyber security violations—and we have been implementing sanctions for that entire period of time. I just want to review a little bit of it.

On top of it, as I indicated, the President has used his IEEPA authority for additional sanctions activity. The President signed an Executive order that allows for sanctions on any nation or individual who authorizes, directs, or sponsors interference in our elections.

The National Defense Authorization Act, signed by the President last year, included numerous provisions designed to strengthen our deterrence against foreign interference.

The President has taken a strong stand against Russia for its malign activities, including imposing sanctions on more than 300 separate Russian-related targets through 32 distinct actions; imposing sanctions against 7 Russian oligarchs, their 12 companies and 17 senior Russian government officials; establishing rolling designations to strengthen sanctions in response to Russian aggression against Ukraine and Russian efforts to evade sanctions on North Korea, Syria, Iran, and others; imposing sanctions against 16 entities and individuals, including affiliates of the Russian Internet Research Agency for their roles in Russian interference in our elections; imposing sanctions against three individuals and five entities in Sudan assisting the IRA financier, Prigozhin, in evading previously imposed sanctions; designating three additional IRA actors for supporting the IRA's crypto currency accounts; imposing sanctions on Russian-related oil brokers for their role in assisting the circumvention of sanctions against Venezuela; expelling 60 Russian intelligence officers from the United States. And the list goes on. The argument that this administration and this Senate have done nothing is simply false.

Let's just talk a little more about election interference. The administration here, domestically, has taken unprecedented action to bolster the security of our elections and to counter foreign malign influence. President Trump signed into legislation passed by this Senate that spent more than $1.2 billion in the States for election

security, infrastructure strengthening, and technological enhancements.

The President funded the formation of the Election Infrastructure Information Sharing and Analysis Center, a center which helps share security information with elected officials across all 50 States and more than 2,400 local and territorial electoral offices.

The administration has conducted hundreds of cyber security assessments at no cost to election officials and provides vulnerability reports on a weekly basis.

The administration has traveled the country to hold exercises in training with State and local election officials and their private sector partners to improve and test their ability to prepare for and respond to cyber incidents.

The administration has held multiple national-level tabletop-to-vote exercises with thousands of State and local election officials and private sector partners nationwide.

The administration has provided tailored security guidance to nearly 6,000 local election jurisdictions.

Under President Trump, the administration has pushed to increase the security of elections through auditable paper ballots, and now more than 92 percent of the voters in the general election will cast their ballots with an auditable paper record.

I could go on and on about this, but the bottom line is, yes, we do need to work and continue to be alert—and my colleague from Maryland knows that I am willing to work on these issues—but we can't just continue to have these take-it-or-leave-it, no-amendment, no-opportunity-for-change unanimous consent requests in the context of the obstruction effort being undertaken right now to try to delay and interfere with a vote on Amy Coney Barrett.

We can work on all of these issues. I invite my colleagues on the other side to vote yes the next time we try to bring a COVID relief bill to the floor.

Because of these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for the comments, but to suggest that this is a fight over the schedule and not an effort to protect our elections from what we know is an ongoing and continuing imminent threat, I believe, misses the point entirely.

He mentioned that this is a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. I would suggest that the Senate has already taken this because we voted unanimously last year, as part of the Defense authorization bill, to adopt this provision as part of our national defense to defend our democracy. Every single Senator voted—or no one came forward to object at that time. Yet here we are 12 days out from election, no action taken. We get this report yesterday about foreign interference, and nobody should say: Oh, we are shocked there is foreign interference in our election going on. The shocking thing is we haven't done enough.

I appreciate him listing some of the actions the administration took about particular Russian individuals, oligarchs, but as you know, and as we know, the DETER Act is not aimed at just punishing particular bureaucrats and apparatchiks who are obeying the orders of President Putin. The whole idea is to deter President Putin by making him understand that he and his country will pay a price if they interfere by sanctions on the banking sector and on the all-important energy sector in Russia.

In order to stop interference, we need to do two things: We need to harden our systems at home. My colleague mentioned some of the actions that have been taken to do that. I will remind my colleagues that Democrats put forward the proposal for more resources for State and local governments to harden those defenses, and it was only after a big fight and lots of opposition from the Republican leader here in the Senate that we were able to get those funds. Additional funds have been sitting in the Heroes Act which passed the House 5 months ago and yet nothing.

In the proposal put forward the other day by the Republican leader, there was no more money to harden our defenses. But hardening our defenses is not enough. What you want to do is prevent the attacks in the first place, prevent the interference in the first place. And so long as that is cost-free to Vladimir Putin or any other adversary, they are going to go for it. They have got nothing to lose. They have got everything to gain by sowing more unrest and lack of confidence here.

So the way to deal with that is the DETER Act. And the Senate agreed, at least with that unanimous vote a little while ago, and then nothing happened. Yet, we got report after report from our intelligence community that—no surprise—we have this ongoing interference.

The Senator mentioned all these actions the Trump administration has taken. Obviously, Vladimir Putin didn't get the message. He didn't get the message. Taking pinprick actions after the fact isn't going to scare off Vladimir Putin or any of our adversaries. The only way to get them to focus and stop interfering is to say now, up front, that if you cross this wire, if you trip this threshold and interfere in our elections in certain substantial ways, it is going to hurt—not just somebody in the bowels of your bureaucracy or one intelligence officer or five or ten, but it is going to hurt, and you are going to feel the pain in your country.

So I must say I remain incredibly disappointed that, even at this late hour, we are unwilling, as a body, to take this very important action, just as we have been unwilling to act on the Heroes Act, both the first version and the second version.

I think, as my colleagues know, the Democratic leader has proposed that we adjourn subject to being called back for the purpose of acting on a bipartisan agreement, which we would all like to see, on a COVID–19 response bill but something which the Republican Senate leader has said he is unwilling to pursue, even the contours of an agreement that have been discussed between Speaker PELOSI and the administration. The majority leader continues to block that, and we continue to see today blocking a measure to protect our democracy with 12 days to go before November 3.

So, again, I think we are going to rue the day that we weren't clear, up front, that the United States is going to stand up and protect its democratic process.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, just to briefly respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, first of all, the notion that there has been blockage of a deal on this side is news to me. The notion that we did not accept the Heroes Act from the House is not news. Trying to put the Heroes Act on the floor of the Senate without the opportunity for debate or amendment is also not the right way to try to build bipartisan legislation for a deal.

I also find it incredible that this administration's actions sanctioning Russia are considered to be a pinprick in comparison to whatever greater sledgehammer is supposedly needed.

The CAATSA legislation that I referenced, which was passed in the first year following the election of President Trump, which President Trump signed and supported, was a massive increase in American sanction authority against Russia—and North Korea, by the way—and has been utilized more by this President than any sanction authority that any other President has ever had. The sanction regime that we are putting in place today against Russia is designed to go aggressively at election interference. The argument that nobody is doing anything is simply wrong.

Now, I stand ready to work to build even stronger sanction regimes that can work without destroying our own economy or work without destroying our own industry in different sectors, which is part of the problem with the bill that is being proposed without amendment here today. But we need to recognize that the accusations that this administration and this Senate do not take election interference seriously when we passed the most significant, sweeping legislation that has ever been passed in this country to deal with it—and that there is no effort to try to work on the COVID relief package—is just part of, frankly, the political attack of the day.

I am sorry. This is simply wrong. If we want to work together on either of these two issues or other issues, we can

on this floor, but we can't do it by these kinds of motions to adjourn and unanimous consent requests to bring bills to the floor and pass them without amendment. It is just not the way. And my colleague knows this is the kind of thing that Republicans and Democrats do. They want to bring attention to their legislation. But that is not the way you build a bipartisan agreement that can actually become law.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I will be very brief in response.

This is a bipartisan bill. It has bipartisan cosponsorship. We have been working for 3 years. We have made changes. And the proof that everything we are doing right now is not working is the fact that we just had the DNI say we continue to have Russian interference and other interference in our election. That is why we have to do something.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the colloquy here between our colleagues on election interference. I am privileged to serve on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that has undertaken a 3½-year-long investigation of the election interference that occurred in 2016, and I think the five-volume report of the Select Committee on Intelligence—bipartisan report—is indicative of the seriousness with which we all treat this subject.

But I appreciate the Senator from Idaho, the chairman of the Banking Committee, for his comments, for refreshing all of our memories about the huge amounts of money that we have spent in assistance to State and local election authorities, as well as the good work being done by the Department of Homeland Security to help them secure their networks against cyber attacks, as well as other elements of the U.S. Government, including our intelligence community, the National Security Agency, and others.

This is important work, but I agree with him—this is not how we actually build bipartisan consensus here, by coming and asking for unanimous consent without going through the appropriate procedures and, frankly, the hard work that it takes to build consensus.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. President, on another matter, today the Senate Judiciary Committee advanced the nomination of Judge Amy Coney Barrett to serve on the Supreme Court.

Throughout her hearing last week, Judge Barrett wowed America and certainly my constituents in Texas with her impressive knowledge of the law and her clear understanding about the limited but important role that judges play in our Republic.

She followed the precedent set down by Ruth Bader Ginsburg, the so-called Ginsburg rule, and refrained from answering questions on how she would rule in future cases or commenting on contentious political issues. I think she was correct to do so. We shouldn't embroil judges in the political controversies that we debate here. Judges are not policymakers, primarily. They are certainly not accountable to the voters. They have lifetime tenure. That is why their responsibilities are limited but important at the same time. Nor by asking her questions back in 2017 about her religious beliefs, whether she is an orthodox Catholic, having to listen to statements like ''Well, the dogma lives loudly within you'' because she is a woman of faith, suggesting that somehow she would violate her oath as a judge and impose her own views instead of the law from the role—from the bench.

Well, I think Judge Barrett took all of us to school a little bit and reminded us very clearly that it is a judge's job to impartially apply the law as written, whether it is the Constitution itself or the laws that Congress passes. She not only stated her commitment to this most basic principle, but she also has a record to back it up. During her time on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Barrett has sided with her colleagues 95 percent of the time in more than 600 cases.

It is no surprise that the American Bar Association, which the minority leader has called the gold standard, gave Judge Barrett its highest rating, saying she is well qualified to serve on the Supreme Court. But we all knew that.

As I looked around the room during the first day of questioning, I noticed all the binders that people like me and my other colleagues had—notebooks, piles of paper, books, reference books on both the desks of Republican and Democratic members of the committee. If my colleagues' materials preparing for this historic hearing were anything like mine, they included previous decisions by Judge Barrett, academic writings, letters of support, and detailed background information about her career.

But I noted that, as Judge Barrett was answering our questions, she seemed to be doing so without even glancing down at any notes. So I asked Judge Barrett—I violated the No. 1 rule that you learn as a lawyer not to ask a question you don't know the answer to. I did it anyway because I had a hunch. I asked her to hold up the notepad sitting in front of her to show us what materials she had been using during the hearing. It was a memorable moment. She held it up and smiled, and it was blank. I think that spoke volumes about her competency, her preparation, her intelligence—all things that would commend her confirmation.

Well, with each question she answered, Judge Barrett demonstrated her vast knowledge of the law. She made clear she understood, as I said, the limited role of judges, and she showed compassion and heart as she poured herself into her work each and every day.

Numerous Senators have noted that, under ordinary circumstances, a nominee like this would get overwhelming support, but unfortunately these aren't normal circumstances. Our colleagues on the other side made clear from the get-go that, for them, this confirmation process wasn't even about the nominee or her qualifications. They attempted to hijack the hearing and use it for—well, it is a harsh word, but it is true—fearmongering.

Last week's hearing was like split-screen TV. On one half, Republican Senators asked the judge about her judicial philosophy, prior rulings, and a range of constitutional doctrines. On the other half, our Democratic colleagues delivered monologues about ObamaCare—about a future case that she may be called upon to participate in. They attempted to convince the American people that if she was confirmed, she would somehow take away their healthcare. Well, that is, at bottom, an insult to the judge. It somehow presumes that she is essentially auditioning for the job based on her ruling in a future case. That would violate every aspect of a judge's oath.

As Judge Barrett noted, judges don't make policy pronouncements; they decide cases. And she very carefully described the case that is pending in front of the Supreme Court. It is not about ObamaCare writ large; it is about a technical doctrine called severability: If one part of a statute is deemed unconstitutional—and this one, I believe, is, the individual mandate, because we zeroed out the penalty under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act—the question is, Does the rest of the legislation—does the rest of ObamaCare stand, or does it all have to be struck down?

Well, she noted that there had been a number of cases decided recently by the current Supreme Court that seemed to treat severability with particular care. Indeed, as a scholastic, as an academic, I think she and others noted that it is not exactly appropriate for judges to go out and strike down statutes except to the extent that they are unconstitutional.

They said: If she is not coming for your healthcare, she will serve corporate interests, destroy the environment, somehow chip away at our liberties.

These are nothing but baseless scare tactics and stunts from our Democratic colleagues. The latest one came this morning, when they actually boycotted the Judiciary Committee vote on Judge Barrett. They couldn't even be bothered to show up and vote against the nominee they claim is a threat to our democracy. So do you know what? Judge Barrett was confirmed unanimously by the Senators present today.

Instead, in their chairs, they had large photographs, much like we have seen at sports arenas and ballparks in the wake of the pandemic, since we have had to socially distance. You can't have a large crowd at the ballpark. So people have these cutouts.

That is what it looked like in the Judiciary Committee today.

As I said, because of their antics, because of this stunt, Senator GRAHAM asked for unanimous consent to proceed with the markup, and, of course, there was no objection because any potential objector had voluntarily absented themself.

The truth of the matter is, Judge Barrett's qualifications speak louder than the unsubstantiated claims made by her opposition. She graduated at the top of her class from Notre Dame Law School. She held two prestigious clerkships, including on the Supreme Court. She has litigated in the trenches before transitioning into academia, where she wrote and taught constitutional law, about our Federal courts and statutory interpretation. And, as I said, for the last 3 years, she has put all of that great experience and training to work on the Seventh Circuit.

This is an exceptional judge with a clear record of faithfully and impartially applying the law, and she will bring additional value to the U.S. Supreme Court.

One of the things I thought was so remarkable is that Judge Barrett is also an incredible role model. I think her elevation to the highest Court in the land should be an encouragement to young women who aspire to professional success and as a great role model on how to balance what we all try to figure out how to balance, which is your professional and your personal life. She and her husband do a marvelous job with their seven children, both being full-time professionals.

If confirmed, she would be the first mother of school-aged children to serve as a Justice and only the fifth woman to serve on the high Court. She would also be the first Justice on the current Court with a degree from a law school other than Yale and Harvard and bring much needed educational diversity to the bench.

Judge Amy Coney Barrett will serve our country well on the high Court, and I have full faith in her ability to faithfully and impartially apply the law as written.

I want to thank Chairman GRAHAM for leading a fair and respectful hearing. The ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, made that observation, and I thought that was very generous and civil of her. I would note that many of the more radical folks on the left have attacked Senator FEINSTEIN for her civility, and they are just wrong. I think she remains a good role model for all of us. We can have our disagreements without being rude or uncivil or disagreeable. I think Senator FEINSTEIN is a model for that.

I am proud to support Judge Barrett's nomination in the Judiciary Committee, and I look forward to voting for her next week on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there are a lot of inscriptions—famous words, inspirational sayings—that are detailed into and painted onto the walls of the Capitol. One of my favorites, which I think also happens to be one of the shortest, adorns a wall, I believe, on the way into the House Chamber. The saying is attributed to Alexander Hamilton, and it reads, simply: Here, Sir, People Govern.

Here, Sir, People Govern. It is purposeful that that quote finds its way onto the walls of the Capitol Building because this is the branch of government that is given primacy by our Founders. It is no coincidence that we are the article I branch. Governing—the process of setting the rules by which the country lives—is supposed to happen here, in the article I branch, the elected wing of American democracy.

But as all of my colleagues know, there has been very little governing here happening of late. This Congress—this Senate—has been effectively dead. Here in the Senate, half the normal bills have been passed during this Congress, compared to normal years, and nearly one-third of that legislation that we have finished has just been renaming postal buildings or authorizing commemorative coins. In fact, over the last 2 years, the Senate has spent floor time on a grand total of 20—20—pieces of legislation that weren't routine or emergency spending measures. That is less than one bill a month. We are getting paid $170,000 a year to work on one substantive piece of legislation every 30 days.

Now, perhaps you could intellectually reconcile this legislative desert if there were no problems to solve in America, if not a single major change in law was necessary. That, of course, is not the case. A pandemic disease has killed over 200,000 Americans. An opioid crisis that rages largely unchecked took another 70,000 lives last year, just in drug overdoses alone. One out of 10 Americans are out of work today. Wildfires and hurricanes and droughts, caused by a man-made warming of the planet, ravage our landscape. No, there are really big problems that need to be solved—deadly problems, existential problems.

I keep searching for the reason that no legislation is happening here, especially since the Senate does actually seem to be doing something. I mean, I am here voting most weekdays. So we must not be totally out of business. No, in fact, the Senate has been doing something, and that something is confirming judges to a record number of vacancies in the Federal court system.

Those record vacancies were created by Senator MCCONNELL, who refused—refused—to confirm any judicial nominees, including to the Supreme Court, during President Obama's final 2 years in office. And the primary reason that Senator MCCONNELL has stopped passing legislation and has turned this institution into a judge-confirming simple machine is because the modern Republican Party currently owns a policy agenda that is about as popular as a pair of wet socks.

More people without health insurance and higher rates? Nobody wants that. Easier access for dark money to influence Congress? Not very popular. Less regulation of financial companies and polluters? No, few people out there are clamoring for that. The criminalization of abortion? Not a big groundswell in America. The elimination of the firearms background check system? Yes, pretty much everybody hates that idea too.

You see, no parts of that agenda can actually pass Congress. Certainly not now, with Democrats in charge of the House. But they couldn't even get it done when they had control of the Senate, the House, and the White House. They spent months trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act, for instance, but because Republicans figured out that they would all lose their seats if they repealed the law, they gave up and walked away.

Frankly, they gave up on it all, not just because they feared the electoral backlash—no, also because they found another way to get their agenda done. You see, Republicans found another place for that Alexander Hamilton quote. It turns out that they can't—or they don't want to—govern here. But they found a way to get another branch of government, insulated almost completely from popular opinion, to implement their world view. They want that inscription—Here, Sir, People Govern—to move to a building a block away, on the other side of First Street—the U.S. Supreme Court.

With the elevation of Amy Coney Barrett to that Court, Republicans will have completed their methodical, careful surgical procedure—the transplant of American rule setting from the abdominal cavity of this building to that of the building across the street.

I want to explain what I mean by this, but, first, let's just lay down an obvious predicate about the process that brought us to this moment. It is important. Senate Republicans were not telling the truth, as it turned out, when they said in 2016 that they believed the Senate shouldn't confirm a Supreme Court Justice in the final year of a President's term. Shocker—they didn't actually mean what they said. They said it, in 2016, to try to put some lazy, razor-thin veneer of intellectual legitimacy on their refusal to let President Obama fill a vacancy on the Supreme Court, as was his duty and right under the Constitution. But we know now that their obstruction of Merrick Garland was, of course, just a simple, naked, anti-democratic, anti-constitutional power grab.

They should have just admitted it then because at least it would have avoided the mind-blowing hypocrisy of this sudden, stunning reversal of position. Now, suddenly, all of a sudden it is OK to confirm a Justice in the last year of a President's term—in the last few months of an election, while people

are actually voting, as it turns out. Of course, it is, because all that matters here now is power. We get that. We will remember. The rules have changed. The Republicans changed them. You went back on your word. And it makes this whole process lack legitimacy.

It is important to stipulate that, but it is an insufficient explanation, admittedly, of my opposition to Amy Coney Barrett, because the consequences of this nomination go far beyond the downward spiral upon which Republicans have placed this institution. No, the real travesty here is that transplant of lawmaking from here to the Supreme Court and what it is going to mean for regular people out there when 5 of 300 million Americans—5 people who are unelected and totally unaccountable to popular opinion—start changing the rules under which we all live because the rule changes they support and their political movements support are so wildly unpopular that they couldn't be passed in Congress. So they had to be enacted over in the Supreme Court.

Seventy times since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, Republicans have tried to gut all or part of the law. Thirty-one times the Republicans tried to repeal it in its entirety. They shut down the entire Federal Government for 2 weeks, trying to strong-arm Democrats to acquiesce to their demands to end health insurance for 20 million Americans. But all 31 times, they failed—most spectacularly, of course, in the summer of 2017.

So, having failed here at this political imperative, Republicans turned to the courts. Senator CORNYN kind of explained what they did for you in his remarks just before mine. He said, Republicans put into the 2017 tax bill a relatively small change to the Affordable Care Act that opened it up to judicial assault. Then, not coincidentally, Republican attorneys general, joined by President Trump, sued to invalidate the entire law because of that one small change. Senator CORNYN talked about severability. That is not what the plaintiffs in the case, including President Trump, are asking for. They are asking for that change in law to bring down the entirety of the ACA, and President Trump confirmed that, once again, today in an interview on ''60 Minutes.''

A Republican-appointed judge ruled for Trump at the district court, and then a Trump-appointed, McConnell-confirmed judge provided the decisive vote at the appeals court in favor of striking down the law. Now that entire law is up for legal challenge at the Supreme Court, and—surprise—the hearing to invalidate the entirety of the Affordable Care Act is in 3 weeks.

You wonder why we are rushing through this nomination in record time. Amy Coney Barrett, who has already stated on the record that she thinks the law, even before the changes in the tax bill were made, is unconstitutional, has been selected specifically in order to be the fifth vote to invalidate the Affordable Care Act.

That is not conspiratorial thinking. That is the President's word. He has said he is not going to put people on the Supreme Court unless they do the opposite of what John Roberts did.

The same goes for Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh. They have all been picked for the Court because of their willingness to bend the law and the Constitution, through this riotously flexible doctrine called originalism, to comply with Republican requests of the Court. This new crowd of jurists that are trained, midwifed, and championed by Republican political associations like the Federalist Society are brought up through the farm system and up to the majors to do one thing, to win games for the franchise—the pro-corporate, anti-worker, modern Republican Party.

Really, Coney Barrett's confirmation is just the final act of this plan to make the Supreme Court do what the Republican Congress couldn't—in this case, end the Affordable Care Act and the insurance it provides for 23 million Americans and the protections that it gives to 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

I love this argument that Republicans use that all of a sudden we shouldn't worry about what is about to happen on the Supreme Court, that it is all a construction of our imagination that there is some effort under way to invalidate the Affordable Care Act.

I didn't just wake up yesterday. I have been in Congress since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. I have watched the methodical, daily, unending campaign of Republicans to strike down the entirety of the Affordable Care Act. I watched them make the change to the tax law when they couldn't repeal it through Congress. I then watched mainstream Republican attorneys general all together, en masse, bring a case to invalidate the entire law. I watched the Trump administration break with precedent and join that suit, arguing against his own government's position.

Now I have watched this Senate elevate three people to the Supreme Court who have been brought up through that same political movement and will vote to end those protections in the Affordable Care Act. My eyes have been opened these last 10 years. I know what is going on, and so do the American people.

Joe is a constituent of mine from East Haven. He says:

> After working for decades, I was one of millions laid-off due to the covid-19 economic disaster. Not only was my livelihood destroyed, but my health insurance disappeared along with it. I am not old enough for Medicare nor young enough to feel secure without health insurance. Private insurance and COBRA are simply too expensive for the average middle class individual who now has no income. The ACA is my only option for healthcare coverage.

Margaret from Enfield, CT, says:

> My husband had a near fatal heart attack 2 years ago. He has recovered but requires on-going monitoring. He now has a ''preexisting condition.'' He was laid off from his job . . . six weeks ago [a job he had for 28 years]. We have no income, and [we have] to pay . . . to have his health care continued. Without the ACA, we would not only have no income, but also no health insurance. We would be destitute trying to pay his health care bills.

Imagine 23 million people losing health insurance in the middle of a pandemic. But that is why we are rushing through Amy Coney Barrett's nomination—because there is this chance, finally, to grab the brass ring, to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. If you don't get Amy Coney Barrett on the Court by the time that hearing happens in 3 weeks, it makes that effort a lot harder.

Healthcare isn't the only area of our daily lives that will be changed if Amy Coney Barrett turns the Supreme Court into a new legislative body. Let me take you down another rabbit hole: the use of the Supreme Court to rewrite the Nation's firearm laws.

The National Rifle Association's vice grip over Congress is nearly over. Evidence of that comes from the 2017–2018 legislative session, when the NRA controlled both Houses of Congress, had their man sitting in the Oval Office, and they had priorities, but they couldn't get any of them called up for a vote. Then, in 2018, 30-plus NRA A-rated House Members were removed from office by their voters and replaced by supporters of measures like universal background checks and bans on AR–15s. NRA-sponsored measures can't even get a vote in a Republican Congress anymore because they are so unpopular.

But just like ACA repeal, the window, though it is closed here to weaken our Nation's gun laws, remains open on the Supreme Court. Once again, it is time to abandon legislative action and for Republicans to turn to the Court.

Amy Coney Barrett represents the vanguard of the new, radical, out-of-the-box pro-gun industry thinking on the definition of the Second Amendment. It is the kind of radical, new thinking that is necessary if one wants the courts, rather than the legislature, to invalidate background checks laws, something an elected body could never, ever, ever do, what with 90 percent of the Americans supporting universal background checks.

Amy Coney Barrett's opinion in Kanter v. Barr is a sight to behold, really. In it, she argues it is unconstitutional for a legislature to prohibit felons from owning a gun. She says the Second Amendment guarantees certain felons the right to own firearms, even though 90 percent of Americans think otherwise.

What she writes to back up her view is even more radical, even more dangerous. She says that courts, not the legislature, should be the finder of fact on whether a person is too dangerous to own a gun. And she says that the courts can overturn any gun restriction if they find evidence that refutes the efficacy of the law.

Basically, she is saying the courts are now going to micromanage our gun laws. She believes the Second Amendment puts the courts, not the legislature, in charge of choosing who can own a weapon and who can't. That is, of course, a curiously convenient view for a Republican Party that would love to weaken our gun laws but can't do it through Congress. Now—surprise again—the Supreme Court rides to the rescue.

This, of course, would be devastating for the safety of Americans if criminals could once again buy guns. Last week, I was spending time with Janet Rice, whose son Shane was killed just a few blocks from my house in Hartford. An argument over a girl turned deadly when one angry young man went to the front seat of his car and grabbed an illegal weapon, likely bought through a loophole in the background checks system, and used it to shoot Shane in the back.

Weaker background checks systems mean more illegal weapons, more suicides, more domestic violence murders, but they probably mean higher profits for the NRA's members.

Let's move on to one last priority of Republicans that is stuck, that can't move, in the legislative branch: more power and influence for dark money political groups.

No Member of the Senate who wants to run for reelection in this body would ever introduce a piece of legislation allowing anonymous billionaire donors to gain more influence over the political process. That would be career suicide. No one in America supports that. But these dark money groups are a boon for Republicans because most of the billion-dollar interests that want to influence elections—like the oil and gas industry, for instance—support Republican candidates.

Once again, the Supreme Court becomes that back door to get rules put in place that advance a Republican political interest that could never get enacted by Congress. Amy Coney Barrett will join five other Justices who will all likely rule that most regulations of campaign finance laws, like our Federal and State laws restricting the size of donations to campaigns, are constitutionally invalid.

The Court has already ruled that the Constitution protects a corporation's right to spend limitless amounts of political money. That is just the beginning. Billionaires want all of our campaign finance laws eviscerated, and that new radical, out-of-the-box thinking on the First Amendment suggests that day is coming if Amy Coney Barrett does what is expected of her and joins other ultraconservatives on the Court to strike down our remaining campaign finance laws.

Here, Sir, People Govern. That is what the inscription says on the walls of the U.S. Capitol. It used to be true. Now the inscription should probably read ''Here, Sir, People Confirm'' because now, with an activist, rule-setting, norm-busting Supreme Court, there is really no need for Republicans to pass laws anymore. The Coney Barrett Court will do all the lawmaking Republican interests require. And, frankly, if Democrats win this November, that same Coney Barrett Court will just invalidate any attempts that Congress tries to make to expand the Affordable Care Act or pass universal background checks or protect voters' access to the polls.

I get it. I know it feels weird to hear somebody like me describing Amy Coney Barrett as extreme because she doesn't look extreme; she doesn't talk in extreme tones. But, really, look at what she stands for: the elimination of the Affordable Care Act, the right of felons to own guns, the interpretation of a Constitution to allow for the flood of billionaire money into politics. Those are extreme views. Do you know why I know that? Because none of that—the repeal of the ACA, the invalidation of our background checks system, the erosion of campaign finance laws—none of that could pass Congress even when the most partisan Republicans were in charge of all of the relevant lawmaking institutions here. That agenda was so unpopular, so marginal, that even a Republican Congress and a Republican President wouldn't touch it in the end.

But over there at the Supreme Court, that is now the place where people will govern after Amy Coney Barrett is rammed through in the quickest confirmation process in modern history, an abomination of a process that makes a mockery of the Senate and the Constitution. Over there, that will become the new power in American democracy, and we are all worse off for it.

I will oppose Amy Coney Barrett's nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL JAY NEWMAN

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, at 4:20 p.m. today, which is in about 5 minutes, we are going to vote on a Federal judge. We are going to vote on whether to confirm Judge Michael Newman to be the next Federal judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

I have known Mike Newman for over three decades, and he is an excellent choice for this role. He is an active member of the legal community in Ohio and is particularly active in his community of Dayton. He is also involved nationally. He was the first magistrate judge ever to be appointed national president of the Federal Bar Association, through which he created an impressive national civics program to allow young people, including a lot of young people in the Southern District of Ohio, to meet with Federal judges. He started and presides over the Southern District of Ohio's Federal Veterans Treatment Court, which has helped more than 70 veterans with PTSD and opioid addiction. I have seen the court in action.

Mike is doing a great job. In fact, this year, he was selected to receive the Ohio State Bar Foundation's Ritter Award, which is a lifetime service award given to one lawyer or judge in Ohio every year to recognize a long-term commitment to ethics, professionalism, and integrity. That is Mike.

Judge Newman is the right choice for this important seat in his having served the community of Dayton with honor and distinction, and I am confident he will do the same in this new role. I urge my colleagues to, in a moment, strongly support his confirmation.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. President, of course, this week, we are also continuing to consider an important nomination of another Federal judge—Seventh Circuit Judge Amy Coney Barrett—to fill the Supreme Court vacancy.

Yesterday, I had the chance to sit down one-on-one with Judge Barrett to ask her questions and follow up on what I thought was an impressive performance before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Even before our meeting, what I knew about Judge Barrett suggested she would be a good candidate for this important role. Based on what I heard in our meeting, it is clear to me she is not only well qualified to serve on the Court but that she is also a great listener and has the right understanding of what the Court's role is. She will be a terrific Supreme Court Justice. I believe she also understands the need to address the lack of faith in our institutions in this city, including the Court, and is willing to play an important role in helping to rebuild trust.

Importantly, she reiterated to me what she said in the committee, which is that she has a commitment to interpret the text of the Constitution and the laws as they are written rather than through the lens of her own policy and personal preferences. I appreciate that modest approach. It leaves the legislating to the representatives, who have been elected by the people, rather than to the unelected judges. Of course, we are also all inspired by her personal story and her commitment to her faith, to her family, and to her profession.

Let's be honest. During normal, less partisan times, this woman would be confirmed overwhelmingly. I believe she is an excellent choice. I commend the President for nominating her, and I strongly support her confirmation to the U.S. Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, while we have another minute, let me just say on another topic, which is the coronavirus pandemic, I am deeply disappointed that yesterday we had another vote here on the floor of the Senate wherein we offered legislation which passed by a majority of the Senators but not the supermajority needed that simply focused on the coronavirus

pandemic and the economic consequences of it. Unbelievably, it was blocked. In other words, we were not able to move forward because the Democrats were not willing to at least get on the issue and begin to discuss and debate the issue. This is sad to me.

We are not out of the woods yet either in terms of the economy or in terms of the pandemic. In fact, we are in the third phase now of the pandemic in many of our States, including in mine, Ohio. We need help. This legislation had that help—as an example, $30 billion-plus for a vaccine. We need that funding to be able to get a vaccine as quickly as possible. We need money for therapies, money for our schools, and money for small businesses to be able to keep their doors open.

I am concerned that we are not using the same bipartisan approach we used four other times in this Chamber to help deal with the coronavirus pandemic.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON NEWMAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired on the Newman nomination.

The question is, Shall the Senate advise and consent to the Newman nomination?

Mr. LANKFORD. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), 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 67, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Ex.]

YEAS—67

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

NAYS—30

Baldwin	Cardin	Durbin
Bennet	Casey	Gillibrand
Blumenthal	Coons	Heinrich
Booker	Duckworth	Hirono
King	Murray	Stabenow
Klobuchar	Reed	Udall
Markey	Sanders	Van Hollen
Menendez	Schatz	Warren
Merkley	Schumer	Whitehouse
Murphy	Smith	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Harris	Jones	Sinema

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to recess and ask for the yeas and nays.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or to change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—4

Harris	Kaine
Jones	Sinema

The motion was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO PAUL IGNATIUS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, next month, our country will salute the life and achievements of former Secretary of the Navy Paul Ignatius as he celebrates his 100th birthday. I would like to join Paul's family and friends in recognizing his years of leadership and service to our country.

The son of Armenian immigrants, Paul completed his undergraduate studies at the University of Southern California. There, he entered the Phi Kappa Tau brotherhood, the same college fraternity I would later join at the University of Louisville. Paul's achievements on campus were just the beginning of his remarkable life.

Like so many other members of the Greatest Generation, Paul put his life on hold to serve in uniform during World War II. He interrupted his studies at Harvard Business School to enlist in the U.S. Navy and was commissioned as a lieutenant. As an aviation ordnance officer, Paul served aboard the escort aircraft carrier USS *Manila Bay* in the Pacific.

Returning home after 4 years in the Navy, Paul completed his MBA at Harvard and began a successful career in the private sector. However, our country would call on him once again. When it did, Paul was ready to answer.

In 1961, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara asked Paul to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Army. He agreed and began 8 years of prominent leadership in the Pentagon under both President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson. Paul served in several capacities, including Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics. Finally, in 1967, Paul was chosen to lead the same Navy he joined as a lieutenant more than two decades before.

Paul left the Pentagon and began new ventures in journalism, philanthropy, and scholarship. He has earned several honors and awards for the lasting impacts of his leadership. Last year, Paul received a premier recognition for a Navy veteran and leader. He joined his successor, Secretary of the Navy Richard V. Spencer, at a commissioning ceremony of the USS *Paul Ignatius*, an Arleigh-Burke class guided-missile destroyer.

So it is a privilege to join those paying tribute to Paul Ignatius' lifetime of accomplishments for our Armed Forces and our Nation. As he celebrates his 100th birthday, appropriately on Veterans Day, I wish him the very best. On behalf of the Senate, I extend my sincere gratitude for his service.

REMEMBERING JOHN MCNAMARA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Winston Churchill famously said: ''If you're going through hell, keep going.'' Persevere, don't give up. It is good advice.

Here is another bit of good advice for weathering hard times: Look to a brighter future, but also study the past. Look at how others before you have triumphed over similar difficulties, and learn from their example.

During these hard, pandemic times, leaders and communities—and anyone,

really—would do well to study the life and accomplishments of an exceptional leader, the former mayor of Rockford, IL, John McNamara.

John died on September 30 at the age of 81. As Rockford's mayor from 1981 to 1989, he helped guide Rockford through a national recession, which crippled the manufacturing industry in his city. When he took office, Rockford's jobless rate stood at 11.5 percent. Eighteen months later, it had ballooned to nearly 25 percent, the highest unemployment in the Nation. For the first time since the Great Depression, the city's population declined. The New York Times reported that Rockford was ''bleeding away its jobs and its people.''

Speaking with a Rockford Register Star reporter in 2006, John McNamara recalled those times. He said: ''People would come into my office to tell me about their situation. It was very heart-wrenching and emotional. It hit you in the gut.''

John McNamara steered Rockford through those dark years with a strong leadership style and an irrepressible, infectious sense of optimism. He believed in Rockford's people and possibilities, and he inspired others to believe in them, too.

By the start of his second and final term in 1985, the city's economy was on an upswing. While part of the improvement was due to a broader, national economic recovery, much of Rockford's rebound was the result of bold decisions by McNamara to overhaul the city's government.

He professionalized the mayor's office and realigned the city's finances. He worked to create opportunities for economic growth and prosperity. He made smart investments in infrastructure to create new jobs and attract new industries to Rockford and to diversify and strengthen the city's economic base. He spearheaded the resurrection of downtown Rockford.

He helped to establish a local tourism bureau and an arts council. He committed public funds to turn an old Sears Roebuck building into the Rockford Museum Park, home to the Rockford Art Museum, the Discovery Center, and the Rockford Dance Company.

He worked for social justice for all of his city's residents. In a city where the school district had twice faced lawsuits for racial discrimination, he made racial healing a priority. He told his children that his favorite day of the year was Martin Luther King Day; he loved the inspiration he drew from visits to African-American churches. He established a Mayors Task Force on Homelessness.

He was famous for his blunt speaking style and his booming voice, which echoed throughout city hall. He was funny, with a loud laugh. In his days as mayor, he stood 6-foot-4 and weighed about 180 pounds, tops. People used to marvel that such a big laugh could come from such a thin frame. He greeted people with a big hug and a big smile. He listened.

He was a Democrat who didn't believe that any political party has a monopoly on good ideas. He was elected by Democrats and Republicans, and he appointed people from both parties to serve in city committees. One of his favorite sayings was: ''If you can't make a friend, don't make an enemy.''

A Republican who served during his years as mayor, current Rockford Alderman Frank Beach said: ''John was a strong man [who] loved our community—a man of integrity, a man that put shoe leather to his convictions.''

He motivated and inspired people, and he was energetic and tireless.

Rockford was John's adopted hometown. He grew up in Whiting, IN, where his folks ran a small mom-and-pop grocery. He had two sisters. In his school, he was class president. He also played football, basketball, and baseball, and he was on the bowling team. He earned a bachelor's degree from Notre Dame University and a law degree from the University of Michigan.

In 1965, on a blind date, he met Barbara Runkle, a young woman from the northern suburbs of Chicago. They ate at a diner and walked around Chicago. The next day, he drove 60 miles to see her again. He made that same 60-mile drive to see Barbara every day for months until they married on June 26, 1965.

John and Barbara were married for 55 years and raised six children, three daughters and three sons, including Rockford's current mayor, Tom McNamara.

Shortly after their wedding, John did a tour of duty in Vietnam as a captain in U.S. Army intelligence and earned a Bronze Star. After his military service, he passed up a chance to practice law in downtown Chicago and moved to Rockford to work as an assistant public defender in Winnebago County. He said his work in steel mills and factories during college and law school pushed him toward a practice in which he could help people.

He had public service in his blood. His father had served on the city council and school board in Whiting, and two of his uncles were mayors. John's own career in public office started in 1974, when he was appointed by Rockford's mayor to fill a vacancy in the city's Third Ward. He ran for reelection the following year, winning a 4-year term. He took a year off after his term ended and, a year later, announced that he would run for mayor.

If you asked him what accomplishment he was most proud of as mayor, John didn't mention new buildings or economic development deals. He was proudest that he had helped the people of Rockford believe in a better future during a dark time. He was proud that he chose not to seek a third term, instead endorsing his protege, then-city administrator Charles Box, who would go on to become Rockford's first Black mayor, serving for three terms.

John remained active in Rockford's civic life. He joined William Charles Investments Ltd. He also worked part-time for Rockford University; as the liberal arts college's first vice president for development, he helped save it from going under during tough times. In 2009, I was honored to nominate John to serve on a Federal Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, an independent, bipartisan panel formed to advise Congress and the U.S. Secretary of Education on making college more affordable. He just never stopped trying to help people.

I will close with this story. On a chilly spring day in 1978, when John was serving on the city council, he helped save the life of a man who jumped off the State Street Bridge. John was in the Rockford Register Star building when he saw the man teetering on the bridge's railing. He took off running, but by the time he reached the bridge, the man had already jumped into the frigid Rock River. With the help of another man and a 16-year-old boy who happened to be passing by, John pulled the man out of the river. The only casualty was the new suit he was wearing, a bit of a luxury for a defense lawyer with six young children.

John McNamara later told a columnist: ''I was shaking all the rest of that afternoon—not because I was cold. You just hate to see a guy get that despondent.''

That was John McNamara in a nutshell, willing to act boldly yet humbly to give someone else hope. He was a class act who led by example, and he was my friend. Loretta and I offer our condolences to John's wife Barbara, their six children—John, Kate, Dan, Mary, Nell, and Tom and their spouses—and to John and Barbara's 16 grandchildren. He loved them all deeply. He will be missed.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMERGENCY NURSES ASSOCIATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator WICKER, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Emergency Nurses Association. Made up of 51,000 members from all across the globe, the Emergency Nurses Association, or ENA, is the only professional organization dedicated to advancing excellence in emergency nursing and is the world's premier organization for emergency nurses.

Founded in 1970 to set standards for best practices in emergency nursing care, the ENA has provided continuing education programs for emergency nurses, as well as a united voice for nurses involved in emergency care.

Among its accomplishments, ENA has worked successfully to raise awareness and improve outcomes for the Nation's trauma patients. For Americans aged 44 years or younger, traumatic injuries—including car crashes, falls, head injuries, burns, and firearm injuries—are currently the leading cause of

death. Working to improve outcomes for those who have suffered a traumatic injury, ENA offers courses for emergency nurses that provide them with the knowledge, skills, and hands-on training needed to deliver high-quality trauma care. ENA's trauma nursing core course is one such course. Since its inception in 1986, this course has been taken by more than 1 million emergency nurses and is now considered the gold standard for the education of nurses in lifesaving trauma care techniques.

ENA was also at the forefront of supporting the MISSION ZERO Act, or the Military Injury Surgical Systems Integrated Operationally Nationwide to Achieve ZERO Preventable Deaths Act. When this legislation was signed into law last year, it created an innovative program allowing military trauma teams and professionals to work in civilian trauma centers to ensure the highest quality trauma care in both peace and war.

Finally, ENA has been the leader in raising awareness regarding the issue of workplace violence directed towards emergency nurses and other emergency department personnel. At the State level, it advocated for stronger criminal laws to hold those who assault healthcare workers in hospitals accountable for their actions. At the Federal level, ENA has fought for tougher workplace standards to ensure that hospitals provide a safe working environment for their employees.

On the occasion of the Emergency Nurses Association's 50th anniversary, Senator WICKER and I ask our colleagues to join us in extending our deepest gratitude to the ENA and all its members for their commitment to improving the quality of emergency care that has and will continue to save the lives of millions of Americans across our country.

USHER SYNDROME

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to talk about a genetic condition called Usher syndrome. Usher syndrome is a rare genetic disease that affects at least 25,000 people in the United States. Usher syndrome causes deafness or hearing loss, as well as a retinal disease that progressively leads to blindness. Some children may be diagnosed at birth, while others are diagnosed at later stages of adolescence, affecting education, employment, and quality of life.

Usher type 1 individuals are born deaf and then learn, often before adolescence, that they are also losing their vision. Usher type 2 individuals are born with moderate to severe hearing loss and then in the prime of their adolescent lives are told that they are losing their vision. Usher type 3 are usually diagnosed during adolescence, leading to the slow loss of both hearing and vision.

At present, there are no treatments or cure for Usher syndrome, but that could change with awareness and support. Finding a cure has never been more urgent or more achievable. Promising research and positive clinical trials are occurring right now at universities, medical centers, and private laboratories across the country.

Even though there is currently no cure for Usher syndrome, I am proud that Oregonian researchers are leading the way searching for treatments and therapies. The Casey Eye Institute at Oregon Health & Science University—OHSU—is conducting the first human study of gene therapy for Usher syndrome, and researchers at the University of Oregon are generating animal models that represent the genotypes of the major Usher patient groups—both necessary steps towards the development of effective treatments. It is a privilege to serve a State that is home to such cutting-edge research into Usher syndrome.

To accelerate this research, the Usher Syndrome Coalition, including Emily Creasy from Oregon, is raising public awareness. Last month, on September 19, they helped recognize the 6th annual Usher Syndrome Awareness Day. The day fell near the autumnal equinox, which marks the start of days that contain more darkness than light, a powerful metaphor for the threat of Usher syndrome. I am proud to support the Usher syndrome community and am committed to doing what I can as Oregon's senior Senator to support researchers hard at work finding treatments and, hopefully, a cure. I am committed to working with my colleagues to raise awareness regarding this disease, and I applaud the hard work of the Usher Syndrome Coalition in making Usher syndrome research a priority at the National Institutes of Health.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO VIC BIRD

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am pleased to recognize Mr. Vic Bird on the occasion of his retirement. Vic has been a champion for the Oklahoma aviation community for nearly two decades. He most recently served as the director of the Oklahoma Aeronautics Commission for 18 years, the longest serving director in Oklahoma history.

You would never know it, but back in 2002, Vic Bird was a newcomer to aviation. Nevertheless, there is no one in State government who worked harder to make Oklahoma the aviation capital of America. Vic Bird led the charge on numerous State legislative initiatives that brought aviation employers to Oklahoma, and the proof is in one number. Today, aviation and aerospace is Oklahoma's second largest industry, with an annual economic impact of $44 billion.

Throughout his tenure at the Oklahoma Aeronautics Commission, Vic has been a true friend to general aviation, supporting pilots and airports. Vic Bird was instrumental in making sure Oklahoma State law protected pilots at public-use and military airports by keeping dangerous structures from being built too close to airport infrastructure. Vic Bird promoted airports as anchor institutions supporting economic development and job growth in communities across Oklahoma and joined me in an aerial tour of general aviation airports across Oklahoma back in June 2017.

Before I conclude, I want to highlight two of the awards and recognitions Vic Bird has received that speak volumes of his commitment to aviation. The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association awards the Joseph B. ''Doc'' Hartranft Jr. Award to an individual in government service who has made significant contributions to the advancement of general aviation. Vic Bird was the first and only nonelected official to receive this award. Vic Bird is also the first and only Oklahoman elected to serve as chair of the National Association of State Aviation Officials.

Vic Bird has remained an unwavering passionate advocate for aviation and aerospace in Oklahoma. I know I join his family and all that know him, in thanking him for his years of service and contributions to Oklahoma and our entire aviation community.

Congratulations on your retirement.•

TRIBUTE TO DEAN A. COLLETT

• Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today I offer my recognition of the great service of Dean A. Collett to countless Utah students. His service has spanned over six decades, starting in the fall of 1956 when he first walked through the doors of Highland High School. Today, at the age of 92, even through the difficulties of COVID–19, Dean sits at his desk making personal phone calls to each of his students, ensuring nothing less than their academic success. He is a true servant of the people of Utah and one who deserves the highest of honors.

Dean Ashton Collett was born on September 30, 1928, to Richard G. Collett and Amy Ashton Collett in Salt Lake City, UT. Richard Collett was a successful banker, but due to the economic turmoil of the Great Depression, the Collett family, with all five of their children, would move frequently around Salt Lake City looking for work, a hardship that would follow Richard and Amy for much of their lives. From those moments as a child, Dean would dedicate his entire life helping to support his family, working to keep food on the table and later taking care of his mother until her passing. Dean spent his youth working as a paper boy, doing yard work for hire, and later working as a grocery store cashier at Table Supply in the avenues of Salt Lake City.

As the family kept relocating in search of work, Dean attended Emerson Elementary School, Ensign Elementary School, and Washington Elementary School. He progressed through

his educational pursuits, graduating from East High School in 1945 and later from the University of Utah in 1956. Before completing his time at the University of Utah, Dean served a 3-year mission in Sweden for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Upon his return, he was drafted into the Korean war and stationed in Germany due to his knowledge of both Swedish and German. Once he graduated from the University of Utah, Dean was given his first teaching job at a then brandnew school called Highland High School in Salt Lake City. Little did he know at the time that serving this school would end up being his whole life's mission.

During Dean's time at Highland High School, he has taught the subjects of math, English, yearbook, student government, German, and Russian; acted as a cheerleading adviser; and is now a school counselor. His time at Highland has spanned more than 63 graduating classes and more than 30,000 students. He is an avid football fan and has yet to miss a single Highland High football game in the school's entire history. You will often see him selling tickets for sporting events, dances, plays, and any other community events at the school. He has been a father figure to thousands and helped students in need of clothing, food, and financial assistance, including for those serving a church mission. Dean never married or had children of his own, but instead dedicated his life to the children of Highland High School.

My own staffer, Matt Holton, was a student of Dean's in the early 2000s and got to experience Dean's extraordinary dedication to his students firsthand. While Matt was a freshman, his father was deployed with the U.S. Army in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Dean saw a student in need of additional care and so took Matt under his wing, becoming a crucial mentor and father figure in his life. To this day, they remain close friends.

Dean was also a teacher of a dear friend of mine, former Governor of the State of Utah, U.S. Ambassador to China, and U.S. Ambassador to Russia Jon Huntsman. Dean often teaches the students of Highland High School that failure is a critical ingredient to success, using the example that Jon Huntsman, who ran and lost for student body president, later achieved the highest offices of public service.

Dean is an undeniable institution not only at Highland High School, but throughout the entire State of Utah. He is a Utahn from the Greatest Generation, embodying the best of the American spirit; and it is my privilege to honor him today.●

REMEMBERING DR. ALAN CRANDALL

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Alan Crandall, of Salt Lake City, Utah, who passed away on October 2, 2020. A leader in the ophthalmologic community, Dr. Crandall was senior vice chair and director of glaucoma and cataract at the University of Utah John A. Moran Eye Center.

Alan was born on June 13, 1947. In 1969, he received his undergraduate degree from the University of Utah, where he stayed to earn his medical degree in 1973. He later returned to the University of Utah as a professor and chairman of the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences.

In his career, Crandall pioneered several surgical techniques and participated in clinical studies used to impact the future of ophthalmology and used his skills to further the next generation of ophthalmologists through training and mentoring surgeons. As founder of the Global Outreach Division of the Moran Eye Center and past president of the American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery, Dr. Crandall spent nearly four decades helping those in need access high-quality eye care. Dr. Crandall's service to the field of ophthalmology continued as a member of the National Board of Medical Examiners and the American Board of Ophthalmology.

His philanthropy was widespread, performing free surgeries in his local community and in dozens of developing countries around the globe. I traveled with Dr. Crandall to Guatemala and Haiti to help perform vision restoring cataract surgeries and saw firsthand his compassion and commitment to curing preventable diseases.

Dr. Crandall's humanitarianism was so renowned that he received numerous international awards for his work. He is the only physician to have received four of the most prestigious humanitarian awards in ophthalmology from the American Glaucoma Society, the American Academy of Ophthalmology, the American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery, and the Chang Family Foundation. Additionally, Rotary International awarded him with both the Health Care Heroes Award for Excellence in Health Care and Community Outreach and the Vocational Excellence Award for Humanitarian Service.

On behalf of all ophthalmologists, together we mourn the loss of an outstanding surgeon and even greater man. Alan was a steadfast ambassador to the field of ophthalmology, and his true selflessness will certainly never be forgotten.●

TRIBUTE TO MARGIE MONTGOMERY

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, 50 years ago—several years before the landmark Roe v. Wade decision—a young mother was so moved by a news story calling for the legalization of abortion in Kentucky that she began to share her concerns with family, friends, and anyone who would listen. Out of her passion, the Kentucky Right to Life was born, and for 50 years, Margie Montgomery has nurtured, grown, and led this organization. Last week, Margie announced her retirement. We celebrate alongside her that countless lives have been saved through the efforts of Kentucky Right to Life over the past five decades. She leaves a strong organization in place that will continue to protect the unborn who are, in Margie's words, ''unique, living human beings, made in the image of God.''●

RECOGNIZING SCOTLYNN USA DIVISION, INC.

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. It is my privilege to recognize a small business with award-winning innovation that provides high-quality service and is active in its community. This week, it is my pleasure to honor Scotlynn USA Division, Inc., of Fort Myers, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Ryan Carter founded Scotlynn USA Division, Inc., in 2010, the year after the Great Recession ended. Ryan worked for a Cincinnati freight brokerage firm and identified a market demand for reliable, customer-focused delivery of time-sensitive perishable goods. Together, Ryan and his younger brother, Brad, established Scotlynn USA in Fort Myers as a transportation and logistics provider in southwest Florida. The business grew quickly, moving in 2012 from their original 900-square-foot office into their current 12,000-square-foot building.

Today, Scotlynn USA has grown into an award-winning logistics firm operating a truck fleet and freight brokerage that distributes perishable foods nationwide. Ryan serves as the executive vice president, and Brad is in a managerial role. They foster a sense of community among their employees, resulting in high employee retention rates, and they prioritize hiring veterans. Ryan serves on a number of nonprofit boards and volunteers with several organizations, including Big Brothers Big Sisters, Habitat for Humanity, and St. Matthews House. Uniquely, Scotlynn USA provides its employees 16 hours of annual leave to volunteer with local organizations.

Scotlynn USA has received industry recognition for its entrepreneurship and innovation. Notably, it received early help from the Florida Small Business Development Center—SBDC—located at Florida Gulf Coast University, FGCU. They provided Scotlynn resources, including mentorship, business planning, and access to capital advice to help them establish their business. In 2019, the Florida SBDC at FGCU awarded Ryan the Distinguished Entrepreneur of the Year title. This year, Ryan was named as the 2020 U.S. Small Business Administration—SBA—Florida Small Business Person of the Year and was named first runner-up for

the SBA 2020 Small Business Person of the Year.

Like many Floridian small businesses, Scotlynn USA rose to the occasion and supported their community during the coronavirus pandemic. Working with Feeding America, they raised funds for charity and distributed more than 3,500 free meals. Partnering with Community Cooperative and Midwest Food Bank, Scotlynn USA donated logistical support and truck space, enabling these two food banks to distribute approximately 2 million pounds of food to Floridians in need.

As an essential business, Scotlynn USA managed to stay open, keep their employees safe, and play a key role in keeping our Nation's supply chains running smoothly. In April 2020, the SBA launched the Paycheck Protection Program—PPP—a small business relief program I was proud to author. The PPP provides forgivable loans to impacted small businesses and nonprofits who maintain their payroll during the coronavirus pandemic. Thanks to their PPP loan, Scotlynn USA was able to retain 214 jobs and continued serving their customers and community.

Scotlynn USA exemplifies the critical role that small businesses play in investing in community development. Their leadership and commitment to their customers and employees is commendable, especially during these unprecedented times.

Congratulations to Ryan, Brad and the entire team at Scotlynn USA Division, Inc. I look forward to your continued success in Florida and throughout the United States.●

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–5689. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Final Regulations - Rulemaking and Guidance Procedures'' (34 CFR Part 9) received in the Office of the President Pro Tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5690. A communication from the Executive Director, Office of General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Additional Withdrawal Options'' (5 CFR Part 1631) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5691. A communication from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2019 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; and Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5692. A communication from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's annual submission regarding agency compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and revised Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–123; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5693. A communication from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2020 Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act submission of its commercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5694. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2021–01, Introduction'' (FAC 2021–01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5695. A communication from the CEO and Director of the United States Agency for Global Media, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2020 Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act submission of its commercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5696. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Facilitating the Use of the WIPO's ePCT System to Prepare International Applications for Filing with the United States Receiving Office'' (RIN0651–AD43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5697. A communication from the Supervisor of the Regulations and Dissemination Team, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Strengthening Wage Protections for the Temporary and Permanent Employment of Certain Aliens in the United States'' (RIN1205–AC00) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 8, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5698. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Strengthening the H–1B Nonimmigrant Visa Classification Program'' (RIN1615–AC13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5699. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Justice, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5700. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures Miscellaneous Amendments; Amdt. No 3913'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31321)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5701. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures Miscellaneous Amendments; Amdt. No 3914'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31322)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5702. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures Miscellaneous Amendments; Amdt. No 3911'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31319)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5703. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bell Helicopter Textron Inc.) Helicopters; Amendment 39–21194'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0598)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5704. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation (Type Certificate Previously Held by Allison Engine Company) Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0679)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5705. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21178'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0214)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5706. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21172'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0337)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5707. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21173'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0588)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5708. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–21175'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0009)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5709. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; PZL Swidnik S.A. Helicopters; Amendment 39–0675'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0675)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5710. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; PZL Swidnik S.A. Helicopters; Amendment 39–21169'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0753)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5711. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; DE Aviation Czech s.r.o. Turboprop Engines (Type Certificate Previously Held by WALTER Engines a.s., and MOTORLET a.s.); Amendment 39–21167'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–0967)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5712. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. Turboprop Engines; Amendment 39–21166'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–1021)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5713. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters; Amendment 39–21176'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1123)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5714. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; PZL Swidnik S.A. Helicopters; Amendment 39–21187'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0705)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5715. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21157'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0097)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5716. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Agusta S.p.A) Helicopters; Amendment 39–21179'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0204)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5717. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP Airplanes; Amendment 39–21165'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0334)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5718. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21159'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0577)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5719. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 29–21162'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0578)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5720. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Austro Engines GmbH Engines; Amendment 39–21161'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–1113)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5721. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Formerly Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–21161'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0617)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5722. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Daher Aircraft Design, LLC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Quest Aircraft Design LLC) Airplanes; Amendment 39–21146'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2018–0180)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5723. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21164'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–1099)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5724. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries Airplanes; Amendment 39–21160'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0644)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5725. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21163'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0579)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5726. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.A Helicopters; Amendment 39–21181'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0215)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5727. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39–21182'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0566)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5728. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Aspen Avionics, Inc.; Amendment 39–21192'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0723)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 13, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Benjamin Joel Beaton, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

Kristi Haskins Johnson, of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi.

Taylor B. McNeel, of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi.

Kathryn Kimball Mizelle, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Thompson Michael Dietz, of New Jersey, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. COTTON:

S. 4843. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to repeal the exemption from registration under such Act for persons providing private and nonpolitical representation of trade and commercial interests, and the exemption from registration under such Act for persons filing disclosure reports under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, in connection with the representation of business organizations organized under the laws of or having their principal place of business in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 4844. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to reauthorize the grant program to promote responsible fatherhood, to modernize the child support enforcement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 4845. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct surveys to collect data regarding the prevention, reduction, and mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions, soil carbon sequestration, and forest wood and tree carbon sequestration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 4846. A bill to establish requirements for skilled nursing facilities, nursing facilities, and assisted living facilities to manage the outbreak of COVID–19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 4847. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the effects of the COVID–19 pandemic on the travel and tourism industry in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 4848. A bill to continue the whole-of-government approach to ending global wildlife poaching and trafficking by permanently reauthorizing the activities of the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 4849. A bill to require additional disclosures with respect to nominees to serve as chiefs of missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 751. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 23, 2020, as a national day of remembrance of the tragic terrorist bombing of the United States Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, in 1983; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 752. A resolution condemning the Chinese Communist Party's use of forced labor and other coercive measures to destroy religious freedom in Tibet; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 753. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 754. A resolution requesting information on the Government of Azerbaijan's human rights practices pursuant to section 502B(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 755. A resolution requesting information on the Government of Turkey's human rights practices pursuant to section 502B(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 39

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 39, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to complete a study on barriers to participation in federally funded cancer clinical trials by populations that have been traditionally underrepresented in such trials.

S. 2546

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2546, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 2715

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2715, a bill to develop and implement policies to advance early childhood development, to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2741

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 2741, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 3471

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3471, a bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

S. 4103

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4103, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the use of telehealth for substance use disorder treatment, and for other purposes.

S. 4326

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4326, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to honor the 100th anniversary of completion of coinage of the ''Morgan Dollar'' and the 100th anniversary of commencement of coinage of the ''Peace Dollar'', and for other purposes.

S. 4422

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4422, a bill to establish the Office of Minority Broadband Initiatives within the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 4429

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4429, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study regarding toxic exposure by members of the Armed Forces deployed to Karshi Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan, to include such members in the open burn pit registry, and for other purposes.

S. 4482

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4482, a bill to require the Secretary of State to submit to Congress an annual report regarding instances of Arab government retribution toward citizens and residents who engage in people-to-people relations with Israelis.

S. 4613

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4613, a bill to amend the Fairness to Contact Lens Consumers Act to prevent certain automated calls and to require notice of the availability of contact lens prescriptions to patients, and for other purposes.

S. 4622

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4622, a bill to amend the Act entitled ''Act to provide for the establishment of the Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes'' to provide for inclusion of additional related sites in the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 4647

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4647, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to establish a cattle contract library, and for other purposes.

S. 4792

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4792, a bill to extend the availability of Coronavirus Relief Fund payment funds for States or governments that use such funds to respond to the COVID–19 public health emergency in accordance with a qualifying economic development plan.

S. RES. 709

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) 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. 745

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor 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.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 751—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 23, 2020, AS A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE TRAGIC TERRORIST BOMBING OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS BARRACKS IN BEIRUT, LEBANON, IN 1983

Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 751

Whereas, in 1982, the United States deployed members of the Armed Forces to Lebanon as part of a multinational peacekeeping force;

Whereas, early on the morning of October 23, 1983, a truck packed with explosives detonated outside of a building at Beirut International Airport that served as quarters for several hundred members of the Armed Forces deployed as part of the peacekeeping force;

Whereas 241 members of the Armed Forces were killed in the blast;

Whereas the members of the Armed Forces killed included 220 Marines, members of the Battalion Landing Team, 1st Battalion, 8th Marines Regiment, which made October 23, 1983, the deadliest day for the Marine Corps since the Battle of Iwo Jima in February and March 1945 during World War II;

Whereas, in addition to the Marine Corps casualties, 18 Navy sailors and 3 Army soldiers were killed, and more than 100 other members of the Armed Forces were injured;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces from 39 States and Puerto Rico died while serving in Beirut, Lebanon, from 1982 to 1984;

Whereas, on the same day as the bombing of the Marine Corps barracks, another suicide bomber killed 58 French paratroopers housed at another building in Beirut; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper to recognize the events of October 23, 1983, and the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died in Beirut on that day through the establishment of a national day of remembrance on October 23, 2020: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of a national day of remembrance on October 23, 2020, for members of the Armed Forces of the United States who were killed or injured by the terrorist attack on the United States Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, on October 23, 1983; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to support and participate in appropriate ceremonies, programs, and other activities in observance of such a national day of remembrance.

SENATE RESOLUTION 752—CONDEMNING THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY'S USE OF FORCED LABOR AND OTHER COERCIVE MEASURES TO DESTROY RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN TIBET

Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 752

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party has long persecuted Tibetans for their religious beliefs, including by illegitimately claiming authority to designate the Dalai Lama's successor, destroying religious institutions, and arbitrarily detaining, disappearing, and torturing Tibetans in order to compel adherence to ''normal religious activities'', as sanctioned by the Party;

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party has launched a policy of Sinicization of Tibetans and escalated its attacks on Tibetans by removing Tibetan farmers and herders from their land, compelling them to cede control of their land and herds to state authorities, transferring them to state facilities where they are subjected to forced labor training programs, political indoctrination, and other abuses, and sending them to state-assigned jobs in Tibet and other parts of China, often far from their families and communities;

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party views forced labor and other coercive measures as acceptable practices for strengthening the Chinese economy, while simultaneously suppressing or eliminating religious and ethnic groups that it views as inherently threatening to its rule and other political ambitions;

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party's actions in Tibet, like its actions in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region and other parts of China, reflect the Party's belief that might makes right and its determination to use every measure at its disposal, no matter how heinous, to consolidate power and advance its interests; and

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party believes that might makes right not just domestically, but also in international relations, as evidenced by its actions in the Taiwan Strait, the South and East China Seas, along the Sino-Indian border, and in cyberspace, as well as its use of economic threats to silence or otherwise compel nations, businesses, and individuals to accede to its demands throughout the Indo-Pacific region and beyond: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Chinese Communist Party's campaign against religious freedom in Tibet, including its plainly illegitimate efforts to designate the next Dalai Lama, which is a matter that should be determined solely within the Tibetan Buddhist faith community;

(2) calls for an investigation into the Chinese Communist Party's use of forced labor, in addition to other coercive measures, to force Tibetans to practice their faith in a manner compliant with the Party's interpretation of ''normal religious activities'';

(3) calls on United States companies to scrutinize their supply chains and divest of suppliers and other partners that use Tibetan or other forced labor programs or are unable to certify that they do not use Tibetan or other forced labor;

(4) calls on the United States Government to proactively support, as per the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (subtitle B of title VI of division A of Public law 107–228; 22 U.S.C. 6901 note), the Dalai Lama's call for negotiations to resolve the issue of Tibet, including by preserving religious freedom and Tibetan labor rights; and

(5) encourages all nations to condemn the Chinese Communist Party's attempts to impose its will on others, both at home and abroad, and stand together against the Party's hegemonic agenda.

SENATE RESOLUTION 753—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 753

Whereas, according to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey—

(1) up to 12,000,000 individuals in the United States report experiencing intimate partner violence annually, including physical violence, rape, or stalking; and

(2) approximately 1 in 5 women in the United States and up to 1 in 7 men in the United States have experienced severe physical violence by an intimate partner at some point in their lifetimes;

Whereas, on average, 3 women in the United States are killed each day by a current or former intimate partner, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics;

Whereas domestic violence can affect anyone, but women who are 18 to 34 years of age typically experience the highest rates of domestic violence;

Whereas survivors of domestic violence are strong, courageous, and resilient;

Whereas most female victims of intimate partner violence have been victimized by the same offender previously;

Whereas domestic violence is cited as a significant factor in homelessness among families;

Whereas millions of children are exposed to domestic violence each year;

Whereas research shows that boys who are exposed to domestic violence in their households are more likely to become perpetrators of intimate partner violence;

Whereas victims of domestic violence experience immediate and long-term negative outcomes, including detrimental effects on mental and physical health;

Whereas research consistently shows that being abused by an intimate partner increases an individual's likelihood of substance use as well as associated harmful consequences;

Whereas victims of domestic violence may lose several days of paid work each year and may lose their jobs due to reasons stemming from domestic violence;

Whereas crisis hotlines serving domestic violence victims operate 24 hours per day, 365 days per year, and offer important crisis intervention services, support services, information, and referrals for victims;

Whereas staff and volunteers of domestic violence shelters and programs in the United States, in cooperation with 56 State and territorial coalitions against domestic violence, provide essential services to—

(1) thousands of adults and children each day; and

(2) 1,000,000 adults and children each year;

Whereas more than 160 States, counties, and cities have experienced an increase in reports of domestic violence during the COVID–19 pandemic;

Whereas the COVID–19 pandemic increases the isolation of survivors of domestic violence and that isolation is being used as a tool by abusers to exert power and coercive control;

Whereas domestic violence programs and hotlines have seen a substantial increase in contacts since the beginning of the COVID–19 pandemic and are expecting a surge in requests for services when social distancing is no longer necessary;

Whereas local YWCAs shared that between March 31, 2020 and late summer 2020, as a result of the impact from the COVID–19 pandemic—

(1) 69 percent of respondent YWCAs that operate domestic violence hotlines reported an increase in demand for services; and

(2) 64 percent of nearly 100 local YWCAs who provide domestic violence services (either emergency shelter or transitional housing) reported an increase in demand for domestic violence shelter;

Whereas while violence as a lived experience of American Indian and Alaska Native women exists in less pressing times, the COVID–19 pandemic has increased the challenges and barriers to accessing safety by exacerbating already existing issues including—

(1) lack of safe housing for victims;

(2) lack of space in shelters for victims to maintain safe social distancing;

(3) lack of personal protective equipment for staff of tribal shelters and victim services programs;

(4) limited transportation for victims; and

(5) lack of access to adequate health care;

Whereas respondents to a survey of domestic violence programs reported that survivors of domestic violence are facing financial challenges related to COVID–19 and three quarters of those respondents reported that survivors are having trouble accessing food, and more than half of those respondents have reported that survivors cannot pay their bills;

Whereas medical professionals have reported that survivors of domestic violence are presenting with more severe injuries during the pandemic;

Whereas domestic violence programs are having to change the way they provide services in response to the COVID–19 pandemic;

Whereas advocates for survivors of domestic violence and survivors face the same challenges with childcare and facilitating online learning that others do;

Whereas, according to a 2019 survey conducted by the National Network to End Domestic Violence, 77,226 domestic violence victims were served by domestic violence shelters and programs around the United States in a single day;

Whereas non-citizen victims of domestic violence report heightened concerns with accessing law enforcement and services due to uncertainty arising from changing immigration policies and heightened immigration enforcement;

Whereas law enforcement officers in the United States put their lives at risk each day by responding to incidents of domestic violence, which can be among the most volatile and deadly calls;

Whereas Congress first demonstrated a significant commitment to supporting victims of domestic violence with the enactment of the landmark Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.);

Whereas Congress has remained committed to protecting survivors of all forms of domestic violence and sexual abuse by making Federal funding available to support the activities that are authorized under—

(1) the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.); and

(2) the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291 et seq.);

Whereas there is a need to continue to support programs and activities aimed at domestic violence intervention and domestic violence prevention in the United States;

Whereas domestic violence programs provide trauma-informed services to protect the safety, privacy, and confidentiality of survivors of domestic violence; and

Whereas individuals and organizations that are dedicated to preventing and ending domestic violence should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) supports the goals and ideals of ''National Domestic Violence Awareness Month'';

(B) commends domestic violence victim advocates, domestic violence victim service providers, crisis hotline staff, and first responders serving victims of domestic violence, for their compassionate support of survivors of domestic violence; and

(C) recognizes the impact of the COVID–19 pandemic on advocates for survivors of domestic violence and survivors; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(A) continue to raise awareness of—

(i) domestic violence in the United States; and

(ii) the corresponding devastating effects of domestic violence on survivors, families, and communities; and

(B) pledge continued support for programs designed to—

(i) assist survivors of domestic violence;

(ii) hold perpetrators of domestic violence accountable; and

(iii) bring an end to domestic violence.

SENATE RESOLUTION 754—REQUESTING INFORMATION ON THE GOVERNMENT OF AZERBAIJAN'S HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES PURSUANT TO SECTION 502B(C) OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 754

Resolved,

SECTION 1. REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON THE GOVERNMENT OF AZERBAIJAN'S HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

(a) STATEMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, the Secretary of State shall, pursuant to section 502B(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(c)), transmit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a statement, prepared with the assistance of the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, with respect to Azerbaijan.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The statement submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) All the available information about observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedom in Azerbaijan, and a

detailed description of practices by the Government of Azerbaijan with respect thereto, including alleged violations of such rights and freedoms by the Government of Azerbaijan, including—

(A) unlawful or arbitrary killings;

(B) torture;

(C) arbitrary arrest and detention without charges and trial;

(D) political prisoners;

(E) arbitrary interference with privacy;

(F) restrictions on freedom of expression, the press, and the internet;

(G) restrictions on freedoms of assembly, association, and movement;

(H) refoulement of refugees;

(I) restrictions on political participation;

(J) discrimination and violence against women, minorities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex (LGBTI) persons; and

(K) the worst forms of child labor.

(2) The steps the United States Government has taken to—

(A) promote respect for and observance of human rights in Azerbaijan and discourage any practices in Azerbaijan that are inimical to internationally recognized human rights; and

(B) publicly or privately call attention to, and disassociate the United States and any security assistance provided for Azerbaijan from, such practices.

(3) Whether, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, notwithstanding any such practices, extraordinary circumstances exist that necessitate a continuation of security assistance for Azerbaijan and, if so, a description of the circumstances and the extent to which the assistance should be continued (subject to such conditions as Congress may impose under section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304)), and all the facts pursuant to which it is in the national interest of the United States to provide such assistance.

(4) Other information, including—

(A) all available credible information concerning alleged violations of internationally recognized human rights by the Government of Azerbaijan, its armed forces, and associated groups and persons in the context of their activities in the South Caucasus region, including the denial of the right to life, the infliction of civilian casualties, the displacement of civilian populations, and attacks on civilian infrastructure and houses of worship;

(B) the likelihood that United States security assistance, as defined in section 502B(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(d)) and including training and equipment provided under section 333 of title 10, United States Code, has been and will be used in the South Caucasus by the Government of Azerbaijan in a manner inimical to internationally recognized human rights; and

(C) a description of the steps the United States has taken to—

(i) discourage any practices by the Government of Azerbaijan, its armed forces, or associated groups or persons in the South Caucasus that are inimical to internationally recognized human rights; and

(ii) publicly or privately call attention to, and disassociate the United States and any security assistance provided to the Government of Azerbaijan, including training and equipment provided under section 333 of title 10, United States Code, from, such practices in the South Caucasus.

SENATE RESOLUTION 755—REQUESTING INFORMATION ON THE GOVERNMENT OF TURKEY'S HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES PURSUANT TO SECTION 502B(C) OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 755

Resolved,

SECTION 1. REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON THE GOVERNMENT OF TURKEY'S HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

(a) STATEMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, the Secretary of State shall, pursuant to section 502B(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(c)), transmit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a statement, prepared with the assistance of the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, with respect to Turkey.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The statement submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) All the available information about observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedom in Turkey, and a detailed description of practices by the Government of Turkey with respect thereto, including alleged violations of such rights and freedoms by the Government of Turkey, including—

(A) arbitrary killings;

(B) suspicious deaths of persons in detention;

(C) forced disappearances;

(D) torture;

(E) arbitrary arrest and detention without charges and trial;

(F) restrictions on freedom of expression, the press, and the internet;

(G) restrictions on freedoms of assembly, association, and movement;

(H) refoulement of refugees; and

(I) discrimination and violence against women, minorities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex (LGBTI) persons.

(2) The steps the United States Government has taken to—

(A) promote respect for and observance of human rights in Turkey and to discourage any practices in Turkey that are inimical to internationally recognized human rights; and

(B) publicly or privately call attention to, and to disassociate the United States and any security assistance provided for Turkey from such practices.

(3) Whether, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, notwithstanding any such practices, extraordinary circumstances exist that necessitate a continuation of security assistance for Turkey and, if so, a description of the circumstances and the extent to which the assistance should be continued (subject to such conditions as Congress may impose under section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304)), and all the facts pursuant to which it is in the national interest of the United States to provide such assistance.

(4) Other information, including—

(A) all available credible information concerning alleged violations of internationally recognized human rights or international humanitarian law by the Government of Turkey, its armed forces, and associated groups and persons in the South Caucasus, Syria, Libya, and Iraq, including through indiscriminate or disproportionate attacks, the displacement of civilian populations, and attacks on civilian infrastructure and houses of worship;

(B) whether United States-built F–16s have been used by the Government of Turkey in the South Caucasus since conflict in the region escalated on September 27, 2020, in a manner inimical to internationally recognized human rights; and

(C) a description of the steps the United States has taken to—

(i) discourage any practices by the Government of Turkey, its armed forces, or associated groups or persons in the South Caucasus, Syria, Libya, or Iraq that are inimical to internationally recognized human rights; and

(ii) publicly or privately call attention to, and disassociate the United States and any security assistance provided to the Government of Turkey from such practices in the South Caucasus, Syria, Libya, or Iraq.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess until 12 noon tomorrow.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:22 p.m., recessed until Friday, October 23, 2020, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 22, 2020:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL JAY NEWMAN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO.