



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2020

No. 91

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. 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.

Almighty God, guide our lawmakers today to think of themselves as Your faithful servants eager to do Your bidding. May they strive less for success and more for faithfulness, realizing that You expect dependability from them.

Lord, give them the wisdom to believe that though they may plant and water the seeds of our Nation's destiny, only You can bring the harvest. As they look to You, the Lord of the harvest, soothe their doubts and calm their fears. And Lord, we thank You for the many courageous staffers who enable the Senate to function.

We pray in Your gracious 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask permission to address the Senate in morning business for 1 minute.

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

REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT REFORM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, an important part of my job—and I hope for every Senator—is hearing the views, in my case, of Iowans but in the case of my colleagues, the citizens of

their States. But it is not every day that we hear about the executive branch of government and its bureaucracy making an effort to listen to the American people. Fortunately, that is changing under this administration.

I have advised the people of Iowa, and I am advising them again—and, hopefully, my colleagues will have their constituents take advantage of it—that this administration in January, through the White House, put out a call to Americans who deal with Federal regulations to share their ideas on how to ensure that those who face regulatory enforcement have due process and get a fair shake. Those ideas will now be used to make regulatory enforcement fairer. Take advantage of this opportunity.

Americans who face a burden of complying with regulations should have a voice in making the process better, and I applaud this administration for listening to the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, this pandemic is weighing heavily on the American people. Roughly, 1.4 million Americans have been infected, more than 80,000 have died, and unemployment has not been this high since World War II.

Just a few months ago, millions of hard-working men and women were thriving and optimistic. They were making big plans across kitchen tables. Now all of that is in chaos.

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve reports that nearly 4 in 10 American households that earn less than \$40,000 a year had somebody get laid off in the month of March alone. This emergency is very serious, so the Senate's response has been serious.

In March, Senate Republicans designed and the full Senate passed the CARES Act. It pushed trillions of dollars to working families, job creators, and medical professionals. We sent direct cash to almost 130 million Americans. We delivered hundreds of billions of dollars in paycheck protection loans to small businesses, saving tens of millions of American jobs. We helped State and local governments defray coronavirus costs. We funded healthcare providers and testing. Even now, its programs are still taking effect, still coming online, still helping. The Senate took a blank sheet of paper and turned it into the largest rescue package in history.

We have taken this crisis seriously, but the House Democrats have taken a totally different approach. While we finalized the CARES Act, the House parachuted in with miscellaneous liberal demands that were completely unrelated to COVID-19—solar energy tax credits, airline emissions. One senior House Democrat called the virus a “tremendous opportunity to restructure things to fit our vision.” One Senate Democratic colleague asked: “How many times are we going to get a shot at a \$1 trillion-plus program?” They told us exactly what they were up to, so we ignored the leftwing wish list and stayed serious, and the CARES Act is still helping Americans bridge these temporary shutdowns.

So let's fast-forward to today. The Democratic House is still not back in Washington. Its constitutional duty

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2431

stations are still unmanned, but the Democrats cannot stop salivating over the possibilities for partisan gain.

Former Vice President Biden says he sees this tragedy as an “incredible opportunity . . . to fundamentally transform the country.” Biden said it is an “incredible opportunity . . . to fundamentally transform the country.”

Speaker PELOSI said: “I see everything as an opportunity.”

A cochair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus said: “For me, the leverage is that there is enormous suffering.” “The leverage is that there is enormous suffering.” There are 80,000 Americans who have died and more than 20 million who have lost their jobs. I call that a crisis; they call it leverage.

This week, the Speaker published an 1,800-page seasonal catalog of leftwing oddities and called it a coronavirus relief bill. So here we go again. It includes a massive Tax Code giveaway to high earners in blue States. Working families are struggling to put food on the table, but the House Democrats are prioritizing millionaires on the coasts. It would print another round of checks—listen to this—specifically for illegal immigrants. Can you believe it? We forgot to have the Treasury Department send money to people who are here illegally. My goodness. What an oversight. Thank goodness the Democrats are on the case.

The Speaker's bill also tries to use the virus as cover to implement sweeping changes to election laws that the Democrats have literally wanted for years, like forcing every single State to embrace California's sketchy ballot harvesting whether they want to or not.

Then there is the cherry on top. It is the bold new policy from the Washington Democrats that will kick the coronavirus to the curb and save American families from this crisis. Here it is—new annual studies on diversity and inclusion within the cannabis industry. There is not one study but two of them. Let me say that again. The Democrats' supposed coronavirus bill includes taxpayer-funded studies to measure diversity and inclusion among the people who profit off of marijuana.

The word “cannabis” appears in this bill 68 times—more times than the word “job” and 4 times as much as the word “hire.” Maybe that is just as well because when their proposal does try to treat the economic crisis, it proposes stifling, anti-work policies that would only make it harder for Americans to get their jobs back. For example, they literally propose to raise taxes on small business and drain more cash from Main Street during a Main Street meltdown. So maybe it is best if the House Democrats focus on cannabis studies and leave economics to the rest of us.

This is a totally unserious effort. Even the mainstream media says: “Neither this bill nor anything resembling it will ever become law. It's a Democratic wish list.”

Forget about making law; this thing even fails as a messaging bill. That is what is so remarkable. The House Democrats had a blank slate to write anything they wanted to define the modern Democratic Party—any vision for the society that they wanted—and here is what they chose: tax hikes on small businesses, giveaways to blue State millionaires, government checks for illegal immigrants, and sending diversity detectives to inspect the pot industry. The House gave itself no assignments for 2 months except to develop this proposal. Yet it still reads like the Speaker of the House pasted together some random ideas from her most liberal Members and slapped the word “coronavirus” on top of it—an unserious product from an unserious House majority that has spent months dealing itself out of the crisis.

The House Democrats have been missing in action for months. While the Senate was passing the CARES Act, the Democratic House was on the sidelines substantively and literally. They had already gone home. Nearly 2 months later, the Senators are back at our duty stations with new precautions. We have been back for 2 weeks. We are holding major hearings on the pandemic. We are legislating and confirming nominees. Yet the House is still at home. And when it does contribute, it is not serious.

The House Democrats have checked out of this crisis and left governing up to the Senate. They even intend to shatter congressional history and jam through remote voting so they can continue to be counterproductive from the comfort of their homes. Let me say that again. They even intend to shatter congressional history and jam through remote voting so they can continue to be counterproductive from the comfort of their own homes.

Look, here in the real world, the Senate Republicans are working seriously to help the country reopen. The crushing unemployment figures, even with the CARES Act, show that no amount of Federal spending could substitute for the entirety of the U.S. economy. We need to be smart, and we need to be safe, but we have to find a more sustainable middle ground.

This week, Chairman ALEXANDER and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions heard from Dr. Fauci, Dr. Redfield, and other top experts on exactly this subject. There are at least two big things our Nation will need to start recovering: stepped-up testing nationwide and legal liability protections so that K-12 schools, universities, charities, and employers are not invaded by trial lawyers the instant they unlock their doors.

On testing, fortunately, the Senate has already done a great deal. The executive branch and especially the States are in the driver's seat, but we have already sent billions of dollars to help scale up testing nationwide. On legal liability reform, the work lies ahead of us. As my Republican col-

leagues and I have made clear, strong legal protections will be a hard redline in any future legislation.

That is what is happening here in the Senate—serious leadership on a serious crisis like we have been doing for months. This half of the Capitol is doing our job.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 6172, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, as the majority leader just pointed out, the Senate has been and will be focused on responding to the coronavirus crisis in this country in a way that hopefully will enable the American people to recover and that will restore our economy—that will get things back to normal. As he pointed out, that requires dealing with the health emergency as well as with the economic emergency crisis that has been created by this.

With respect to the health emergency, the leader pointed out that there are literally tens of billions of dollars being spent now on vaccine research, on anti-viral therapeutics, and on testing. We believe that, in order for us to get our economy fully back, we have to deal with the health emergency in front of us, so dollars have been made available—hundreds of billions of dollars—to healthcare providers, hospitals, doctors, nursing homes, and providers who are on the frontlines of this crisis and trying to deal with the challenges it presents every single day. That is what we have focused on. In addition, we have focused on the economic crisis and the impact it has had on our small businesses and on our workers.

Everything that has been included in the bills that have already been passed here in the U.S. Senate—now we have No. 4—and have been signed into law by the President have been singularly

focused on trying to assist people and get them through this time as a bridge to hopefully get the worst of this behind us and get us to a time at which the economy begins to open up again.

Clearly, the focus was on helping families directly, making sure those families who particularly needed the help the most got some additional financial assistance. So checks went out—\$1,200 per individual, \$2,400 per married couple, and \$500 for each additional child—as direct assistance. It went into the pockets of families across this country.

Then, with respect to workers and small businesses, there was the Paycheck Protection Program, which by all accounts has been very, very successful. I think the reason for that is that businesses across this country recognize that they, too, want to keep their employees employed. They do want to keep those jobs, hopefully, until that time when the economy starts to open up again, so they heavily subscribe to this program.

Interestingly enough, there has been a lot of talk on the other side, as there usually is—a demagoging of how this helps rich people and all of that. Yet the average loan in the most recent round of PPP funding is about \$80,000 on a payroll of about \$28,000. Businesses can use that principally for payroll. Seventy-five percent has to be used to be able to keep their employees employed, to keep their workers employed, to keep those jobs there, while 25 percent has to be used for some fixed cost, which might be utilities, which might be rent, which might be debt service, those types of things. The whole purpose of the program is to keep workers employed. It is a pro-worker program, and it has been from the very beginning.

Then also, for those who through no fault of their own have lost jobs and have been laid off, there has been a significant plus-up in the unemployment insurance accounts—to the tune of \$600 per person per week for individuals in this country—on top of what their States might already pay. There is a significant number of dollars being put out there for people who have lost jobs through no fault of their own.

These are pro-worker pieces of legislation, pro-unemployed people legislation. These are pro-small business—keeping those small businesses working out there. Obviously, they are very much pro-health emergency—trying to drive dollars toward the solutions, the cures, the vaccines, the anti-viral therapeutics, and the testing that are necessary to help us get through this. That is what Republicans here in the Senate have been focused on for the past several months and will continue to be focused on in the future.

As the leader pointed out, the House Democrats, who are not here but who, remarkably, from afar have evidently put together this fantasy wish list of things they would like to see accomplished—if you can imagine an 1,815-

page bill, they mention “cannabis” way more times than they mention “jobs.” The amazing thing about this—and they will come here and argue that the Republicans’ proposals benefit the wealthy, benefit the rich. As I just pointed out very clearly, it is the opposite that is true, for it has been directed directly at families and workers. Everything we have done has been designed to keep jobs, to be very pro-worker.

Yet, in part of the 1,815-page proposal that the Democrats have out there, they have a couple of tax proposals, one of which would deliver 56 percent of that tax cut to the top 1 percent of the wage earners in the country. This is 56 percent of the benefit of a proposal under the House Democrats’ fantasy wish list that would go to the top 1 percent of the earners in this country. Now, that doesn’t sound to me like something that is very pro-worker or that is trying to help people who are in the lower income categories, who are suffering the most economically as a result of the coronavirus crisis. It seems, to me at least, like something that is sort of a payoff to some of their big donors and to the big blue States.

Nonetheless, that is a feature of the 1,815-page bill that the leader just described and talked about. It is one of many features—part of the permanent agenda—that has nothing to do with solving the crisis in front of the American people right now but has entirely to do with an ideological wish list. They are all of the things that have been on their agenda for a really long time, none of which should ever be considered seriously in terms of dealing with the crisis that is in front of us right now.

As I said, responding to this coronavirus crisis has been and will continue to be at the top of our agenda for the foreseeable future.

H.R. 6172

Madam President, in addition to our pandemic response, the Senate is also focused on the other priorities on which the American people are relying on us to take care of—from funding the government to protecting our Nation.

This week, the Senate is taking up legislation to reauthorize three expired provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, including the provision that allows the FBI to wiretap lone wolf terrorists—terrorists not affiliated with a specific terrorist organization—and the roving wiretap provision that prevents the FBI from having to seek a new wiretap warrant each time a terrorist suspect changes his phone number.

These provisions lapsed in March, after the House blocked a temporary extension that was passed unanimously in the Senate, leaving law enforcement and intelligence officials without key tools in their anti-terrorism fight. I expect the Senate will pass this bill today, and I hope the House will move quickly to send it to the President’s desk.

Every day, our law enforcement and intelligence personnel are engaged in the difficult and, at times, dangerous work of tracking terrorist threats. We need to make sure they have the tools they need to do their jobs and to keep Americans safe. The bill before us combines extensions of these key anti-terrorism tools with new accountability measures that will ensure that law enforcement is held to the highest standards when pursuing surveillance of suspected terrorists and foreign agents.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation when we vote on it later today.

REMEMBERING TOM COBURN

Madam President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to my friend and a former Member of this body, Senator Tom Coburn, who died in March.

Tom and I first met in the House of Representatives, where we both served, and then came to the Senate at the same time as part of the class of 2005.

I have been privileged to meet many principled men and women in my time in public service, but Tom, literally, was one in a million. He was fiercely principled and uncompromising, often to the chagrin of fellow Senators. He didn’t care if he were 1 against 99 if he believed he was in the right. He stuck to his guns come hell or high water. He voted against politically popular legislation and bills that no other Senator would oppose. Yet he held the enduring respect of his constituents and, indeed, of his colleagues, proving that sometimes principle can win you more lasting friendship than compromise. He was here for a purpose—in particular, to protect our children and grandchildren from the burden of an ever-increasing national debt by exposing government waste and Washington’s spending habits.

He got into fierce fights on the floor in service to that mission, but he knew how to keep fights to the office. Prickly on the floor, outside of it, he was warm and personable, and he didn’t let politics get in the way of friendships. As he once said himself, he disagreed with President Obama on 95 percent of the issues, but that didn’t stop him from developing a lasting friendship with the President or from working with him on legislation when he was in the Senate.

No discussion of Tom would be complete without mentioning his deep faith. He was an outspoken witness for Christ. If you were his friend, as I was privileged to be, he was interested not just in your present good but in your eternal good as well.

As I said earlier, Tom Coburn was one in a million, and it will be a long time before we see his like again. That is a particularly great loss because the Senate should always have a Tom Coburn—a man or woman of uncompromising principle, of fierce dedication to the national good, someone willing to stand alone in defense of the right, who provides a constant reminder that principle is more important than politics

and that what is important is not winning elections but doing the right thing.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Carolyn, and his daughters, Callie, Katie, and Sarah, and his nine grandchildren.

Your husband, your father, and your grandfather is sorely missed.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it has been 2 weeks since Leader MCCONNELL called us back into session. In that time, it was announced that 30 million Americans filed for unemployment. Just this morning, we learned another 3 million Americans filed jobless claims this week. Yet the Republican leader has scheduled exactly zero votes—zero—on legislation related to the coronavirus. Instead, Leader MCCONNELL has resisted urgent and necessary action to fight the pandemic. He said that now is the time to “press the pause button.” Tell that to someone trying to feed his or her children. Tell that to some small business person who has kept a business going for 20 years and now is ready to go bankrupt. Tell that to workers at every level of this economy who are losing their jobs. Time to press the pause button when we have faced the greatest health and economic crisis since the Depression?

MCCONNELL has said Republicans have yet to “feel the urgency of acting immediately.” How many of our Republican Senators have yet to feel the urgency of acting immediately? How many? I would urge the constituents of Senators in every State to call them and ask them that question. Do you agree with Senator MCCONNELL that we have yet to feel the urgency of acting immediately? Well, I could give our Republican colleagues more than 30 million reasons to feel the urgency of acting immediately.

We are staring at a period of prolonged economic misery for millions of American workers and families—Americans who for the first time don’t know if they will be able to keep a roof over their heads, put food on the table, pay the rent; Americans who for the first time are waiting in staggering lines at food banks, cars lined up for miles, snaked across parking lots, people who would never have imagined they would be lining up at a food bank. How long will it take and how much economic hardship will suffice before Senate Republicans feel the urgency to act?

It is not just Democrats who are pleading with the Republican majority to wake up to the economic reality in this country—oh, no. Governors spanning the country in both parties know darn well that this is not a blue State/red State issue. How cheap. A firefighter who is laid off in Florida and a firefighter who is laid off in New York are both hurting, and they are not

looking to what kind of State they are in. So the Governors are calling for help. States, cities, and localities are being forced to lay off teachers, police officers, firefighters, and food health safety workers. It is Governors of both parties. Listen to the NGA, led by a Republican Governor. They need to get unanimous consent for most of the things they do.

It is not just Governors and politicians. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Jerome Powell—hardly a Democrat—a Trump appointee, said yesterday that “the scope and speed of this downturn are without modern precedent, significantly worse than any recession since World War II.” He went on to say that “additional fiscal support could be costly but worth it, if it helps avoid long-term economic damage and leaves us with a stronger recovery.” That is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Jay Powell, appointed by President Trump, telling Republicans to get off their hands and do something. Powell has used almost every tool in his monetary toolkit. He knows we need fiscal relief—more of it. But Leader MCCONNELL has so far rejected doing another emergency relief bill. His party is slowly drafting legislation to give legal immunity to big corporations that put workers in dangerous situations.

That is not the nub of the issue. We know that. We have so many diversions on the Republican side—liability, China. Let’s solve the problem right now. What are we going to do for people who are out of work? What are we going to do for people who can’t feed their families? What are we going to do for businesses that are going under?

Senate Democrats have had to relentlessly pressure our Republican colleagues to hold even the most routine oversight hearings on the coronavirus. Our Republican colleagues say: Well, we don’t want to spend any more money; we have to know how it is spent. Yet they are not having a whole raft of hearings that they should to see how the money is spent. Instead, they are talking about appointing rightwing judges who want to repeal healthcare to the bench. Wow. How out of touch.

The Republican leader made sure the Judiciary Committee had time to consider his protege, a rightwing judge, to sit on the second most powerful court in the country, even though there is no particular need for that nomination at the moment.

The chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee told committee members that next week he was planning on delving into baseless, Kremlin-coined conspiracy theories against the son of Joe Biden, the Democratic nominee for President. Russia comes up with a theory, and the Republicans embrace it instead of doing what they are supposed to be doing.

The Republican majority doesn’t have time to call in the SBA Administrator or FEMA Administrator or hold

a hearing on the shortage of PPE, which our workers on the frontline so desperately need, but all of a sudden, they have time to use a Senate committee to try to slander the President’s political opponent? What world are they in? How out of touch can they be?

We are in the middle of a public health and economic crisis, and Senate Republicans are diving head-first into the muck, pursuing diversionary, partisan conspiracy theories to prop up President Trump when President Trump should be focusing on solving this crisis—once again trying to achieve what the President tried to achieve in the Ukraine scandal by another means, sully his opponent with baseless conspiracy theories. Don’t our Republican friends see the folly of following President Trump in this regard? Don’t they know the American people are wise to this kind of stuff? There are over 30 million people without work, tens of thousands losing their lives, and pursuing baseless conspiracy theories is what the Republican majority seems to be focused on.

Unfortunately, Republicans in Congress aren’t the only ones unwilling to do the urgent and necessary work of the moment. President Trump and his administration are guilty of the same offense. Yesterday, Dr. Fauci—one of the most respected health experts in the country—warned that the reopening of schools and businesses too quickly could lead to unnecessary suffering and death. Asked about Dr. Fauci’s comments, President Trump said Dr. Fauci “wants to play all sides of the equation. . . . [T]o me—it’s not an acceptable answer.”

President Trump, Dr. Fauci isn’t playing all sides of the equation. He is giving you one side of the equation: the truth—the truth, President Trump, without you lurking over his shoulder or contradicting him at a press conference or yelling at a reporter who asks a legitimate question.

We don’t need Dr. Fauci to tell us there are risks to reopening too soon and without proper preparation. That is obvious to just about everyone. That is the truth. But President Trump just inveterately abases the truth if it doesn’t fit with the fantasy he has constructed in his head. The first fantasy was that it was a hoax. The second fantasy was that it will go away in the warm weather.

Well, here we are. It is May. Has it gone away, Mr. Trump? Is it a hoax, Mr. Trump? No, of course not.

Now, one of his latest—that Fauci is making things up or is wrong. He will rush us back to work before we have the proper testing, and we will pay a price. That is what the scientists tell us, and they know best. They are not politicians.

Thankfully, in this big, grand, diverse, and beautiful country, you cannot suppress the truth for too long. Over the past week, a parade of truth tellers has begun. On Tuesday, it was

Dr. Fauci; on Wednesday, Jerome Powell; today, HHS official Rick Bright is testifying in the House. The President may try to shroud the truth from the American people or even from himself, but eventually, inevitably, the truth will come out about how poorly the administration has dealt with this crisis. It is one of the worst performances by a President in American history.

The American people have been following stay-at-home orders for months on end, doing their part to slow the spread of this pernicious disease. Those many millions who sacrificed their routines and livelihoods have bought this country precious time to prepare for life after the pandemic; precious time to ramp up testing, produce PPE, and formulate a plan for nationwide contact tracing. What has the Trump administration done with this precious time? They have wasted it—wasted it.

The President wants to reopen the country as quickly as possible but could not be less interested in the strategies that would allow us to do it safely.

President Trump, do you want to get the country open quickly? Do you want to get people back to the malls and riding on the airplanes? Get the kind of testing that other countries have done. We are still leagues behind on testing.

He said 2 months ago—another Trump fantasy—on March 6 that anyone who wants a test can get one. Tell that to millions and millions and millions of Americans who want testing and cannot get it.

A de facto nationwide lockdown has been going on for weeks. Yet our testing capacity has not approached the number just about every expert says is required. The President, in an emergency, which we certainly have, hasn't requisitioned American manufacturing to produce the tests we need and has been slow to dispense congressional funds intended to help the States do the job. We voted for those a few weeks back. The States are still waiting.

Businesses, schools, sports leagues, and families are going to need guidance from public health experts on how to open as safely as possible.

I talked to hotel executives and sports executives yesterday. They know that without testing, they are not going to come back. If they could test every person walking into a large arena and turn away anyone who might have COVID, people would be far more likely to sit in the seats. In Georgia, where Governor Kemp has been most forward, pushing people to open up, something like 6 to 8 percent of the people showed up. This is 2 weeks after he opened up the malls and the stores. People are not going to go out unless they are sure they won't get COVID, and they can't be sure they won't get COVID unless we have many, many more tests.

What is the President waiting for? He cuts his nose to spite his face. He wants to get us back to work, but he doesn't push testing. The anomalies of

this man—and that is a kind word—just go on and on and on.

People also want to know the guidance—what should they do, what they shouldn't. They want it from scientists. The CDC prepared guidance. The President has held it back so that he and his political appointees can edit it to suit their purposes.

Yesterday, I tried to ask the Senate's consent to release the unredacted, unedited CDC guidance, and Senate Republicans, of course, blocked the request. The junior Senator from Indiana said he didn't want "career regulators"—meaning the experts, meaning scientists at the CDC—to advise the country on how to reopen safely. That the President and his team of political advisers should be able to decide that—is there anyone left in this country, except the most diehard partisans, who trusts this administration to issue medical guidance properly? Come on.

Here is the bottom line: The sacrifices of the American people gave this administration time to prepare the country to return to some semblance of normal. Those sacrifices have been squandered by Trump and his Republican acolytes.

We all want to get back to work—I certainly do—but there is a smart way to begin reopening the country, a way to do it safely, with precautions and testing and tracing, to avoid a resurgence of the disease, and then there is a reckless way. President Trump has so far chosen the reckless way and seems to have no plan to right the ship.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I wanted to start by stating that I know a lot of people look at us speaking on the floor and think, you know, well, why aren't they wearing masks?

I saw Senator SCHUMER. He put on his mask after he finished his talk and left. I have my mask here. I just took it off. I am going to put it on after I finish speaking.

You know the way this works. I wear this mask to protect you, and you wear a mask to protect me, and that is the way we protect each other in this pandemic. I don't think there is any doubt that wearing a mask saves lives, and that is how we are going to overcome in this pandemic.

I see people around New Mexico all the time when I am back home wearing masks and really taking this pandemic seriously and taking our Governor's orders seriously.

H.R. 6172

Mr. President, reauthorization of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, is now before us. We have an opportunity to reform this statute, to protect both our constitutional rights and our security. In the immediate aftermath of 9/11, Congress hurriedly passed the PATRIOT Act and authorized extraordinarily broad authority to the Executive and the executive branch that threatened America's and Ameri-

cans' privacy rights and liberty interests.

In October 2001, I was 1 of 66 Members in the House of Representatives who voted against the PATRIOT Act. It was not an easy vote, but in the years since, it is clear that it was the correct vote because the PATRIOT Act ultimately allowed the government to invade the privacy of millions of innocent Americans.

Exhibit 1: section 215 of the act. Section 215 has been greatly abused, resulting in the bulk collection of hundreds of millions of Americans' phone records and email contact lists.

The Nation was shocked when we found out about this bulk collection in 2013. In 2015, we passed the FREEDOM Act to cure some of the abuses. It did not cure them all.

Section 215 and two other provisions of the PATRIOT Act are up for reauthorization. That is the bill before us. Congress has the opportunity to protect our civil liberties even as we protect national security.

And while the House bill made improvements, it is still flawed. The House version still allows large-scale collection of Americans' sensitive information, and it doesn't reform the FISA Courts to prevent abuses. We should learn the lesson of October 2001 and not rush this through the Senate. We should include amendments to better protect Americans' civil liberties.

I support the Wyden-Daines amendment that prohibits collection of Americans' internet website browsing and internet search history information without a search warrant. It is a missed opportunity for the Nation that the amendment failed yesterday, although by one vote—by one vote.

Right now, the Federal Government can digitally track articles Americans are reading online, social media they are using, where they are shopping, which restaurants they are thinking about going to, and the list goes on and on. Just imagine thinking about everything you do on the internet and your devices. That is open game.

The Fourth Amendment protects us against unreasonable searches. In this day and age, when so much of our life is conducted over the internet, Americans must have assurance that their web browsing, which can reveal highly sensitive information, will not be unreasonably intruded upon by Federal authorities without a search warrant and without probable cause. This information provides an intimate window into our lives. It can reveal a person's medical conditions, political and religious views, and far more.

We need to make clear that government must demonstrate probable cause to collect this type of personal information.

Second, we need to strengthen the oversight of FISA Courts. We know these secret courts are subject to abuse. In 2015, Congress authorized FISA Courts to appoint amici—friends of the court—in cases involving novel

or significant interpretation of the law. This was a positive step forward to provide independent oversight, but it appears there have been only 16 cases in which amici have actually been appointed. Yet there have been more cases than 16 in which novel issues were raised and many more cases where an independent voice is needed to defend civil rights in FISA Court proceedings.

The recent Department of Justice inspector general report examining 25 FISA applications underscores this need. The IG found errors and inadequately supported facts in every application. An expanded amicus role is necessary to bring greater accountability to the application process.

I voted in support of the Lee-Leahy amendment that expands amici participation to significant First Amendment activities; to matters where a religious or political organization, a public official or candidate or the news media is involved; and to matters approving new technology or reauthorizing programmatic surveillance.

Third, we must make sure FISA applications are completely accurate and all exculpatory evidence is disclosed. Accuracy and transparency are critical to maintaining integrity within our justice system.

The Lee-Leahy amendment strengthens the requirements for accuracy and disclosure of all information—including exculpatory information—in FISA applications.

I am pleased this body stood in support of strengthening safeguards in the FISA Court process. However, our failure to protect Americans from the Federal Government looking over their shoulders while they are on the internet and collecting personal information is unacceptable. National security does not require the Federal Government intruding upon the private lives of Americans without probable cause and a search warrant.

Our liberties and freedoms define us as a nation. Either we should reconsider the Wyden-Daines amendment—a motion to reconsider is allowed at this point—or we should vote no on FISA reauthorization. We don't need to sacrifice our liberties and freedoms for an illusion of security.

One of our Founders way back in this country, Ben Franklin, said it a little bit differently. He said: "Those who would give up liberty in the name of security deserve neither."

REMEMBERING DENNIS CHAVEZ

Now, Mr. President, before I yield the floor today, I would like to commemorate one of New Mexico's great heroes, Senator Dennis Chavez, who, 70 years ago this week, on May 12, 1950, stood on this floor of the U.S. Senate and was the first in the Senate to sound the alarm against Senator Joseph McCarthy, who had begun his reign of terror that year.

Dennis Chavez was born into a farming family in territorial New Mexico. He had a seventh grade education and

rose to become a Georgetown University Law School graduate, the first American-born Hispanic U.S. Senator and, at 27 years, the longest serving Hispanic Senator in the history of our country.

Senator Chavez, or "El Senador," as we call him in New Mexico, was a man of great integrity. In February 1950, McCarthy had charged—without proof—that there were 205 card-carrying Communists working in the State Department. By March, he accused American scholar Owen Lattimore, among others, of being a Communist. That accusation—also without evidence—spurred Senator Chavez to take to the Senate floor, to come down here and to speak out.

He told the Senate:

I would like to be remembered as the man who raised a voice—and I devoutly hope not a voice in the wilderness—at a time in the history of this body when we seem bent upon placing limitations on the freedom of the individual. I would consider all of the legislation which I have supported meaningless if I were to sit idly by, silent, during a period which may go down in history as an era where we are permitted curtailments of our liberties, a period when we quietly shackled the growth of men's minds.

Dennis Chavez.

The fact is, we are seeing chilling similarities between the Joseph McCarthy of seven decades ago and the situation we are in today.

Mr. President, this week marks the 70th anniversary of a courageous address to this body. Seventy years ago, on May 12, 1950, the senior senator from New Mexico—Dennis Chavez—was the first to call out the unfairness of Joe McCarthy's communist witch hunt.

In May of 1950, it was still four and one-half years before the Senate would vote to "condemn" the senator from Wisconsin. But, even at that time, early in McCarthy's crusade, Senator Chavez recognized the present danger.

That day, Senator Chavez took to the floor, with 77 other Senators in attendance. That was a time when Senators engaged in genuine, spontaneous debate in this chamber. Senator Chavez counseled his colleagues: "... a man is ultimately remembered by what he does in relation to his times, and the fact that we do our assigned duty may not be enough; sometimes we must step out and sound the alarm."

And sound the alarm against McCarthy, he did.

Dennis Chavez—born Dionisio on April 4, 1888—came from humble and honorable beginnings. He came from generations who had farmed in Los Chavez—a small community along the Rio Grande, south of Albuquerque, in territorial New Mexico. When he was seven, his family moved to Albuquerque in search of better opportunities. He learned English in school but, at age 13, when he was in 7th grade, he had to leave school to help support his family.

Dennis, however, never left his education. He studied engineering, American history, and great political leaders

at the Albuquerque Public Library. In his early 20's, he worked for the City of Albuquerque Engineering Department, and also became active in Democratic politics. He joined the Democratic Party, even though most Hispanics at that time in New Mexico were Republicans. He saw in the "Democratic party a political philosophy that placed human rights above property rights."

In 1917, a newly elected Democratic Senator from New Mexico took Dennis to Washington where he worked for the clerk of the Senate. Dennis took and passed the entrance examination for and eventually graduated from Georgetown University Law School—all with less than a 7th grade education.

He returned to New Mexico to practice law, and was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives—representing New Mexico's one at-large district—in 1930. In 1935, he was appointed to a Senate seat that had become vacant, and was elected in his own right the next year. Senator Chavez served in the Senate until his death in November 1962.

In so many ways, he was far ahead of his time. In the 1940s, he fought for civil rights legislation. In the 1950s, he chaired the Public Works Committee and sat on the Appropriations Committee, and helped usher in major infrastructure projects all over the nation, including water and military projects critical to New Mexico's development.

"El Senador", as we call him in New Mexico, was the first American-born Hispanic elected to the Senate and, at 27 years, remains the longest serving Hispanic Senator in history.

Joseph McCarthy began his reign of terror on February 9, 1950, a speech charging, without proof, that there were 205 card carrying members of the Communist Party working in the U.S. State Department.

By March of that year, McCarthy had accused American scholar Owen Lattimore, among many others, of being a Communist. That accusation, again without evidence, was too much for Senator Chavez and it gave rise to his denunciation on the floor of the Senate.

At that time, in 1950, Republicans held the presidency and both houses in Congress. And no matter one's party—bucking any anti-Communist sentiment could be politically costly.

But Senator Chavez took his chances against Joe McCarthy—in the name of what was right.

He told the Senate that day, "I would like to be remembered as the man who raised a voice—and I devoutly hope not a voice in the wilderness—at a time in the history of this body when we seem bent upon placing limitations on the freedom of the individual. I would consider all of the legislation which I have supported meaningless if I were to sit idly by, silent, during a period which may go down in history as an era where we are permitted curtailments of our

liberties, a period when we quietly shackled the growth of men's minds."

Dennis Chavez's entire career is defined by his courage, by his integrity, by his commitment to justice.

The similarities between Joseph McCarthy and Donald Trump between McCarthyism and Trumpism are—chilling. Both are demagogues. Both lie to the American people. Both try to destroy reputations and lives based on falsehoods.

But the lessons learned from that dark period in our history are lessons we can all learn from today.

First—is the lesson of courage.

In 1950, there were few—of any political party—willing to go up against Senator McCarthy.

But there were exceptions. Less than a month after Senator Chavez's floor speech, the junior senator from Maine—Margaret Chase Smith—the first woman to serve in both the House and Senate—delivered her "Declaration of Conscience" on the Senate floor. Joined by six other brave Republicans, the "Great Lady of Maine" denounced the "hate and character assassination sheltered by the shield of congressional immunity."

Where is that courage now? There are those in the Senate majority who understand the incompetence of this president. That he has an uneasy relationship with the truth. That his words and actions so often undermine basic American values.

But so few ever speak out. No one challenges his lies, his divisiveness, his singular focus on his own ambition to the exclusion of the welfare of American people.

In 1950, there were seven Senate Republicans who challenged Joseph McCarthy.

In 2020, who has the courage to stand up to say, "The Emperor has no clothes"?

Second—is the lesson of truth-telling.

Senator McCarthy—and his chief counsel and chief henchman, Roy Cohn—stacked lies upon lies, wild accusations upon wild accusations. They attacked hundreds of government employees, those in the entertainment industry, academics, and labor-union activists.

Careers were destroyed. Reputations damaged. Lives devastated.

Is this much different than what the President does to those who question, disagree with, testify against him?

The impeachment proceedings against President Trump may seem distant now. But history will remember them. Ambassador Marie Yovanovitch, Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Vindman, Ambassador Bill Taylor, Deputy Assistant Secretary George Kent, Fiona Hill, Pentagon official Laura Cooper, State Department official David Holmes, OMB official Mark Sandy—all told the truth. Stood up to the President and his threats. And all are American heroes.

There is a direct line between Joe McCarthy and Donald Trump: they

chose the same lawyer, Roy Cohn. And the President's threats to the brave men and women who testified are right out of Roy Cohn's playbook.

Third—is the lesson of demagoguery.

Joe McCarthy was a demagogue. His anti-communism met the times. He played upon and stoked fear. And he accused those who spoke out against him of disloyalty to the nation.

As Senator Chavez so eloquently put it on the Senate floor that day: "We have embarked upon a course which breeds hysteria and confusion—a course so dangerous that few dare to oppose the drift lest they be the next marked for destruction."

But before us today—is Donald Trump—and his demagoguery is even more dangerous. He too plays upon fear—and anger. He accuses the free press of being "enemies of the people." He rails against immigrants invading our country, stoking hatred and racism.

He promises working class Americans greater prosperity.

But, in the end, he gives the tax breaks to the rich, uses the office for personal gain, and ignores the needs of everyday Americans.

And—in the middle of the most devastating pandemic our nation has faced in a century—he's told the American people no one saw a pandemic was coming, that it's a hoax, that the virus will "magically" disappear, that we have the best testing system in the world all while promoting snake oil remedies that could actually harm Americans.

But—the American people are not fooled. They see the emptiness of his promises, the division he sows, and the lies he tells.

Seventy years ago, Senator Chavez said: "It matters little if the Congress appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars to check the erosion of soil if we permit the erosion of our civil liberties, free institutions, and the untrammelled pursuit of truth."

Those words resonate as much today as they did then.

Members of Congress, of this body—must not permit the erosion of our constitutional institutions, must not permit the erosion of truth.

Now—more than ever—we must aspire to the courage of Senator Chavez. History will be the judge—by rewarding courage and exposing cowardice.

I will finish with one passage from 70 years ago. Senator Chavez said:

It matters little if the Congress appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars to check the erosion of soil if we permit the erosion of our civil liberties, free institutions, and the untrammelled pursuit of truth.

That is our own Senator from New Mexico, Senator Dennis Chavez. Those words resonate as much today as they did then.

I see my good friend Senator PAUL is here on the floor, so I believe he is the next in line.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 1586

Mr. PAUL. The PATRIOT Act was begotten of the most unpatriotic of ideas—that liberty can be exchanged for security. The history of the PATRIOT Act shows that the exchange is a poor one.

As our liberty wanes and wastes away, we find that the promises of security were an illusion. The history of the PATRIOT Act is really a history of how power corrupts and how bias and malfeasance grow when power is unchecked.

The PATRIOT Act allowed a secret court, FISA, to grant generalized warrants to collect personal data from millions of Americans. The spies who run these surveillance programs then lied—for years and years—to us.

One of the most notorious of these liars was James Clapper. When cross-examined under oath by Senator WYDEN, James Clapper denied that the government was collecting data on millions of Americans.

A month later, the whistleblower, Edward Snowden, revealed that Clapper had lied. Snowden revealed that Clapper and others were using the PATRIOT Act to spy on virtually every American. Snowden revealed that the secret FISA Court was allowing a single court order to command the collection of millions of Americans' personal phone data.

Most Members of Congress had no idea that this was going on. In fact, one of the authors of the PATRIOT Act publicly expressed his shock that such a massive surveillance of Americans was occurring with no notification of Congress.

Clapper and others, though, said that is not true. They justified their actions by saying: We have been briefing the Elite 8 Congressmen.

Who were the Elite 8, and who made them elite? The Elite 8 are the majority and minority leaders of the House and the Senate and the majority and minority leader of the Intelligence Committees of the House and the Senate—eight people.

When they were quizzed about this program, most of them said they couldn't remember ever being briefed on it.

But the real constitutional question is, have we not changed and subverted the Constitution to make eight people more important than the rest of us?

So this was a program where they were collecting the data on everybody's phone calls—everybody in America—and you would think there would have to be a debate and approval by Congress, but there were only eight people, and those eight people seemed to be confused that they had approved the program as well.

The idea that a single court order can allow the collection of personal data from millions of people is antithetical to the intentions of the Fourth Amendment.

The Fourth Amendment dictates that the government must identify an

individual and the items and the location to be searched. The Fourth Amendment was intended to forbid general warrants or writs of assistance that, historically, Monarchs had used indiscriminately to collect vast amounts of either belongings or possessions of individuals.

The Fourth Amendment was written to prevent that from happening.

The PATRIOT Act essentially allows for generalized warrants and the bulk collection of personal data. The Fourth Amendment also dictates that a search can only occur when the government proves to a judge that there is probable cause that a crime has been committed. However, under the PATRIOT Act they have lowered the standard.

So there is the constitutional standard—the Fourth Amendment. But, under the PATRIOT Act, the standard now becomes if it is relevant to an investigation. That is a much looser, broader standard, and it is not a constitutional standard.

So the question is, Through these special, secret courts and through the PATRIOT Act, can we allow things that the Constitution actually prevents. What we have done is eroded protections for Americans.

So some of us have said the Constitution should still apply to Americans. If you want to look at the data of foreigners or spy on foreign countries or potential terrorists, by all means, do it, but Americans should still be protected by the Constitution.

The PATRIOT Act doesn't provide this protection and allows anybody to be investigated if the government can prove that it is relevant to an investigation. That standard is so broad that it could mean almost anything. It is hard to imagine something that could not be argued to be relevant to an investigation.

To those of us who prize the rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, the PATRIOT Act is a violation of our most precious rights. The PATRIOT Act, in the end, is not patriotic. The PATRIOT Act makes an unholy and unconstitutional exchange of liberty for a false sense of security. I, for one, will oppose its reauthorization.

Today we are also here, though, to discuss the FISA Court that interacts and uses some of these extra powers, these extraconstitutional powers.

It has been revealed over the last few years that the FISA Court was manipulated, lied to, and ultimately condoned the investigation of a political campaign.

I believe that the authors of the FISA Court, who intended to restrain unconstitutional searches, would be appalled at what the FISA Court has become. They would be appalled that this secret court intended to be used to investigate foreign spies and terrorists was turned into a powerful and invasive force to infiltrate and disrupt the political process.

It should not matter whether you are a Democrat or a Republican or a Liber-

tarian; we should all be appalled at this abuse of power.

The question is, How do we fix it? To my mind, there are two approaches. No. 1, we could try to make the FISA Court less bad by adding procedural hurdles to make it more like a constitutional court or, No. 2, admit that the FISA Court cannot be made constitutional, admit that FISA uses a less-than-constitutional standard when it allows searches to be performed that do not meet the Fourth Amendment.

The Fourth Amendment requires probable cause that you have either committed a crime or are committing a crime. The FISA Court only says the government must prove or assert that there is probable cause that you are connected to a foreign government.

As we have seen, the standards were so lax that when they went to the Trump campaign and said that a certain person was related to a foreign government, it turns out it was untrue. They didn't present facts to the court that actually argued that he wasn't an agent of the foreign government, and that person had no one to argue for him.

The deficiency of the FISA Court and why it is not constitutional is that you don't get a lawyer. You actually don't even get told you have been accused of a crime. The only reason we know that President Trump's campaign got caught up in this is that he won. Because he won and now has the power to open and put sunlight on this, we are now able to see in.

If this had been an ordinary American caught up in this, you would never be told, you would never get a lawyer, and you would be brought before this investigative body and subjected to a search of vast amounts of your private information without probable cause. That is not constitutional, and I don't think we can make it constitutional. I think we should admit that we can't constitutionally allow Americans to be subjected to a search that doesn't follow the Fourth Amendment.

I believe there is no fixing the FISA Court to make it constitutional for Americans. I believe the only solution is to exempt Americans from the FISA Court.

If government wants to investigate a political campaign, which should be a very rare and a very unusual circumstance, to have the government involved in a political campaign, governments should request a Fourth Amendment search from an article III constitutional court.

Some will say: Oh, it is hard; we will never get it. Guess what—even constitutional warrants are mostly granted. The vast majority of them are granted. But guess what—a judge will be a little reticent to get involved in the political process because they know how heated it is and how important it is to our Republic. But that is the way you should investigate a campaign if you are going to.

Opponents of doing the tried and trusted constitutional way will argue

that it takes too long and it is too hard. But guess what—the Constitution was meant to be an onerous standard. The Constitution was meant to be rigorous. Our Founding Fathers understood that justice cannot be achieved in secret courts that neither notify the accused nor let the accused have legal representation. You can't find justice where there is no adversarial process, where you don't get a lawyer.

I think it is high time we quit letting fear overrun our constitutional duty. Today, I offer an amendment that restores the Constitution for all Americans and forbids the secret FISA Court from ever again meddling in our political process.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1586 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 1586.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of authorities under such Act to surveil United States persons and to prohibit the use of information acquired under such Act in any criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of any criminal, civil, or administrative investigation, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATION ON AUTHORITIES IN FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE IX—LIMITATIONS

“SEC. 901. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITIES TO SURVEIL UNITED STATES PERSONS AND ON USE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING UNITED STATES PERSONS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE.—The terms ‘pen register’ and ‘trap and trace device’ have the meanings given such terms in section 3127 of title 18, United States Code.

“(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given such term in section 101.

“(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an officer of the United States may not under this Act request an order for, and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court may not under this Act order—

“(1) electronic surveillance of a United States person;

“(2) a physical search of a premises, information, material, or property used exclusively by, or under the open and exclusive control of, a United States person;

“(3) approval of the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device to obtain information concerning a United States person;

“(4) the production of tangible things (including books, records, papers, documents, and other items) concerning a United States person; or

“(5) the targeting of a United States person for the acquisition of information.

“(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING UNITED STATES PERSONS.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF AGGRIEVED PERSON.—In this subsection, the term ‘aggrieved person’ means a person who is the target of any surveillance activity under this Act or any other person whose communications or activities were subject to any surveillance activity under this Act.

“(2) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), any information concerning a United States person acquired under this Act shall not be used in evidence against that United States person in any criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of any criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

“(3) USE BY AGGRIEVED PERSONS.—An aggrieved person who is a United States person may use information concerning such person acquired under this Act in a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of a criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

“(d) WARRANTS.—An officer of the United States seeking to conduct electronic surveillance, a physical search, installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device, production of tangible things, or targeting for acquisition of information with respect to a United States person as described in subsection (b) may only conduct such activities pursuant to a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure by a Federal court other than the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents preceding section 101 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE IX—LIMITATIONS

“Sec. 901. Limitations on authorities to surveil United States persons and on use of information concerning United States persons.”

(b) LIMITATION ON SURVEILLANCE UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 12333.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) AGGRIEVED PERSON.—The term ‘aggrieved person’ means a person who is the target of any surveillance activity under Executive Order 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note; relating to United States intelligence activities) or any other person whose communications or activities were subject to any surveillance activity under such Executive Order.

(B) PEN REGISTER; TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE; UNITED STATES PERSON.—The terms ‘pen register’, ‘trap and trace device’, and ‘United States person’ have the meanings given such terms in section 901 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (a).

(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), any information concerning a United States person acquired under Executive Order 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note; relating to United States intelligence activities) shall not be used in evidence against that United States person in any criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of any criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

(3) USE BY AGGRIEVED PERSONS.—An aggrieved person who is a United States person may use information concerning such person acquired under Executive Order 12333 in a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of a criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1586

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask that the question be called on the vote.

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

The question is on agreeing to the Paul amendment.

Mrs. FISCHER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted “nay” and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) would have voted “nay.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 85, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 91 Leg.]

YEAS—11

Blackburn	Kennedy	Paul
Braun	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Moran	Sullivan
Daines	Murkowski	

NAYS—85

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Bennet	Grassley	Roberts
Blumenthal	Harris	Romney
Blunt	Hassan	Rosen
Booker	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Burr	Hoeven	Schumer
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Capito	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cardin	Johnson	Shelby
Carper	Jones	Sinema
Casey	Kaine	Smith
Cassidy	King	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Lankford	Thune
Cornyn	Leahy	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Loeffler	Toomey
Cotton	Manchin	Udall
Cramer	Markey	Van Hollen
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	
Gardner	Portman	

NOT VOTING—4

Alexander	Sanders
McSally	Sasse

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 11, the nays are 85.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1586) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 849

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I rise today on behalf of the 74 fallen Vietnam veterans our government has forgotten known as the Lost 74.

On June 3 of 1969, the USS *Frank E. Evans* was participating in a training mission 100 miles from the Vietnam war combat zone, having been sent there in between combat missions; that is to say, neither coming nor going. During the night, the ship collided with an Allied aircraft carrier and sank, killing 74 sailors. Remember, this is just outside of the combat zone, between combat missions.

These 74 Vietnam veterans died in service to our country. The ship had served on several combat tours and had many more scheduled. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the National Mall here in Washington, DC, memorializes over 58,000 military members who paid the ultimate sacrifice during the Vietnam war by displaying their names on its wall.

People from around the world come to see the memorial and pay their respects to those who fought and died for the freedoms we all hold dear.

Yet, because of a technicality, the names of the Lost 74 sailors are excluded from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. As requirements now stand, veterans must have perished in or on their way to a combat zone. Since the *Frank E. Evans* was participating in a practice exercise in between stints in fighting off the Vietnam coast, the names of these sailors have been left off of the wall.

Imagine that. These sailors, deployed overseas in the service of our Nation—they left their homes, their families, their friends, and their loved ones on behalf of our Nation. They paid the ultimate sacrifice, like every other man and woman who was lost. Yet their names have been left off the iconic memorial constructed in their honor. As a parent, I can't imagine the pain that some of these families must have felt.

I first learned of this injustice during a talk radio townhall in 2018, when a family member of Fargo resident and *Frank E. Evans* survivor Dick Grant called in to the program.

After hearing his story, I learned about one of his shipmates, Robert Searle, a fellow North Dakotan from Grand Forks, who was also on board the ship and perished in the accident. Robert enlisted in the Navy Reserves in 1967 and reported to the *Frank E. Evans* in May of 1968. Later that year, he married his wife, Thelma.

Robert was on watch in the forward fire room with three other men when the collision occurred. All four were killed. His twin sons were just 4 months old.

North Dakota paid a great price when the USS *Frank E. Evans* sunk. Yet my State does not grieve alone.

The Lost 74 encompasses sailors from 29 different States, and the bill before us today represents that diversity, spanning the political aisle.

Before I ask for unanimous consent, I would like to yield some time to the distinguished Senator from New York, the Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I will be brief because I know my colleagues wish to join in this wonderful activity here to try and get good recognition.

I join my colleague from North Dakota in strong support of a cause near and dear to my heart: the effort to add the names of 74 sailors to the Vietnam War Memorial who perished in a training accident that sunk the USS *Frank E. Evans* in June of 1969.

As my friend from North Dakota explained, the names of the 74 who died on the USS *Frank E. Evans* have been omitted because they died just outside of the combat zone, but they had seen the heat of battle in Vietnam. The USS *Frank E. Evans* had been part of the Tet offensive and was scheduled to return to the combat zone before sinking.

That these men's lives ended in the tragedy of a training accident rather than in the line of fire makes no difference in the final analysis. They went off to war and laid down their lives in the service of the country they loved.

I was fortunate to know Larry Reilly, Sr., of Syracuse, NY—known to us as Chief Reilly, who was serving on the *Frank E. Evans* alongside his son, Larry Reilly, Jr., on that fateful day in 1969. Larry Sr. survived that day. Junior did not.

For the rest of his life, Chief Reilly petitioned his country to give his son and his fellow shipmates the very least it could give to them—due recognition.

I sat in Chief Reilly's living room, and I have sat on Maryann Buettner's back porch and listened to her tell me all about her son, Terry Lee Henderson, who had also seen combat in Vietnam and also died in that awful accident.

Chief Reilly passed away 2 years ago this month, but his cause does not die with him. These were living, breathing boys who lost their lives wearing the uniform of this great country. To inscribe their names on a memorial is but a small measure of peace for the families they left behind, the rightful act of a nation that recognizes the sacrifices of all its sons.

I yield to my colleague from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am here to add my voice to the eloquence of both Senator CRAMER and Senator SCHUMER about the need to recognize those people who were lost on the *Frank E. Evans*.

We had two sailors from New Hampshire who were lost that day: Ronald Arthur Thibodeau of Manchester, NH, joined the Navy in 1967, and he was assigned to the *Frank E. Evans* as radar-

man. Ron was on watch during the collision, and he was lost at sea, leaving behind a young son.

And Gary Joseph Vigue, of Farmington, NH, was also on watch that night during the fatal collision. Gary had married his high school sweetheart a few weeks before he reported to the *Frank E. Evans* in 1968. Gary also left behind a young son and his two brothers who still live in New Hampshire.

These two men, Gary and Ron, gave their lives for this country. These men were supporting operations during the Vietnam war, and they were planning to return to Vietnam waters once the training exercise was over. So, just like all those other people who were lost in Vietnam, they gave their lives for this country. And just because they were outside some artificially designated combat zone doesn't mean they shouldn't be recognized in the same way the others who were lost in Vietnam have been recognized.

Now, this is May, the month of May. Memorial Day is approaching, a day during which our Nation honors the men and women who have died while serving in the U.S. military. As we recognize the sacrifices of our fellow Americans, I think it is appropriate that the Senate take up and pass the U.S.S. *Frank E. Evans* Act, legislation I am honored to cosponsor with my colleague Senator CRAMER from North Dakota because it is legislation that will ensure the 74 men—those Lost 74—are rightfully honored by adding their names to the Vietnam War Memorial.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure. I thank the Presiding Officer and Senator CRAMER for this effort to ensure that the Lost 74 are recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, whether North Dakotans, Granite Staters, or New Yorkers, these stories are very moving.

When I first heard from Mr. Grant's family, I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I looked into his request and introduced an amendment to the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act to inscribe the names of the Lost 74.

While the measure unanimously passed the House, it was blocked here in the Senate. So, when I came to the Senate last year, introducing this legislation was one of my very first actions and high priorities.

And I have had some success. We have 20 cosponsors—10 Republicans and 10 Democrats—including the chairman and the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee that has jurisdiction. When Members from Montana to Maine, North Dakota to New Hampshire, and New York can come together on an issue as important as honoring the fallen sailors, I would hope this would garner some attention—and it has. It has.

Last summer, the U.S.S. *Frank E. Evans* Act received its first-ever hearing before a Senate Energy Subcommittee. I thank the chairman and

my colleague from Alaska for providing the opportunity for the story of these sailors to be heard.

It was there when I first heard opposition to the bill, however. I have yet to hear any real opposition to the legislation voiced by anyone except the bureaucrats and special interests that would actually be charged with carrying it out. In other words, nobody objects to this except the people who would have to do something about it, and that is a common theme in this town, I have noticed.

For example, the Acting Director of the National Park Service said of the bill: "If passed, it would necessitate substantial modification of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial wall as it exists today." No kidding. Of course it does. That is the point of the bill.

The idea that we should continue to turn a blind eye to forgotten veterans because the work would be substantial is offensive. It is certainly offensive to the shipmates and the families and the survivors of the Lost 74.

Forgive my lack of sympathy for bureaucrats who feel inconvenienced by the death of 74 war heroes. The country that landed man on the Moon the very same year that this accident happened certainly can figure out how to fix a wall to honor these war dead. More to the point, shouldn't we be looking for more ways to honor our fallen rather than fewer?

The opposition's argument simply does not add up. Since the wall was built, hundreds of names have been added, and more work still needs to be done. According to the Washington Post, one soldier's name was etched three times. Thirteen soldiers had their names etched twice. While the wall bears 58,390 names, they represent 58,276 different people. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, which is responsible for the wall, conducted a study which showed that flaws exist with names etched in the memorial. To think that we would not add the names of the Lost 74 when we know corrections already need to be made seems counterintuitive, if not downright lazy.

Yet, despite all of this, despite the veterans being forgotten, despite this legislation being sent here twice by the House, despite a successful hearing on the bill, progress in the Senate has stalled. That is why my colleagues and I have asked the Department of Defense to address this issue as well.

The Department has a mixed, if not negative, record with this issue. They tell you what you want to hear until you go away and hope you never come back. Similar to this body, we have been met with complete silence—not a yes, not a no, not a maybe, not a suggestion to make the proposal better.

We find their silence unacceptable; therefore, I am going to ask for unanimous consent to pass the *Frank E. Evans* Act. The Lost 74, their loved ones, and their shipmates have waited long enough. No matter how it can be spun, the choice before this Chamber is

to give the veterans the recognition they deserve or to stand in their way.

Madam President, with that, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S. 849 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I 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 Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I have the honor to serve as the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which does have jurisdiction over S. 849, the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans Act, but in that capacity as chairman, I now have the unenviable position of having to rise to register an objection at this moment.

I want it to be clear to my colleague from North Dakota, my colleague from New Hampshire, my colleague from New York, and all of those for whom this is a measure on which they are seeking this legislative endorsement—know that I have the absolute highest regard for the men and women who serve our country and the sacrifices they have made for all of us.

As the Senator from New Hampshire just mentioned, as we approach Memorial Day, I think what we seek to do is to try to find ways to honor more of those who have served our great Nation and a recognition that those who lost their lives on the *Frank E. Evans* deserve a form of recognition—a recognition of all those who lost their lives in Vietnam. The story that has been relayed by colleagues here of the USS *Frank E. Evans* is truly one of the most tragic that occurred during the Vietnam war. I am absolutely sympathetic. I have had these discussions with my colleague Senator CRAMER. I appreciate the efforts that he is making now and that he has made prior to his time here in the Senate to recognize these sailors who gave their lives in the incident.

The reality that we face in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee—again, we are the committee of jurisdiction, as we have the oversight of the National Park Service. But it is not the National Park Service that determines what or who is eligible for inscription on the wall. It is the Department of Defense that is responsible for determining whether members' names are eligible for inscription. This is based on very specific criteria that is set not by those of us here in Congress, not by those of us on the Energy Committee; it is set specifically by the Department of Defense.

As has been raised here on the floor, the criteria do not allow or accommodate the timing. The Evans sailors do not meet the eligibility criteria the DOD has set out because it was not in the defined combat zone of Vietnam at the time of the 1969 mishap.

I agree with my colleagues that it is indeed unfortunate that we have this designation, this eligibility criteria that has left the honor that is due these sailors open and unaddressed. It is unfortunate that we are here today and that I stand left in a position to object despite the efforts that my staff on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and I have made to work with Senator CRAMER, work with his team, work with DOD to find an approach that we should all be able to agree on to memorialize these sailors.

As we are looking for that path, I do stand to object to discharging this bill from the committee, but I will make this commitment: This is a matter that must be addressed. It is long overdue. We will find a way to honor these sailors. But at this juncture, there remain practical, legal, and technical considerations we have to resolve with the text with regard to the effort that my colleague from North Dakota is offering today. At this time, I would like to note my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, if I might address a couple of things, first of all, we are here to change legal objections. That is why we are the legislative branch. We are the policymaking branch. The Department of Defense, with as much respect as I have for them and particularly for the Secretary—they work for us. We don't work for them.

I appreciate the commitment of the chairman. I look forward to working with her and the committee on getting to a markup and passing the legislation so that we don't have to submit ourselves to the bureaucracy but, rather, can get things turned around to where the bureaucracy submits itself to the legislative branch.

I thank the President, and I thank my colleagues from New York and New Hampshire and certainly the chairwoman of the Energy Committee and look forward to working on a resolution soon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to begin the vote immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Barrasso	Gardner	Peters
Bennet	Gillibrand	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Reed
Blumenthal	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Harris	Roberts
Booker	Hassan	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rosen
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cardin	Inhofe	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Casey	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Coons	King	Sinema
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Smith
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Stabenow
Cotton	Leahy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Loeffler	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Enzi	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murphy	Young
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—16

Baldwin	Hirono	Tester
Brown	Markey	Udall
Burr	Merkley	Warren
Cantwell	Murray	Wyden
Durbin	Paul	
Heinrich	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—4

Alexander	Sanders
McSally	Sasse

The bill (H.R. 6172), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to urge the Senate to immediately take action to address the issue of elections and specifically to address technical changes to the \$400 million in election security funding passed in the CARES Act and to talk about the coronavirus threat to our democracy itself.

Sixteen States have already postponed their Presidential primaries or transitioned their primaries to almost entirely voting by mail. We have seen Republican and Democratic Governors across the country, from States like West Virginia, Indiana—the Presiding Officer's State—New York, and Kentucky, issue waivers allowing all voters to cast their ballots by mail during the pandemic. This includes States that used to have requirements that you have to give a reason to even get a mail-in ballot to vote from home. Both Democratic and Republican Governors have waived it—not in every State but in a number of States.

While it is important that individual States are taking action to protect voters during this pandemic, it is the responsibility of us, of Congress, to ensure that States have the funds they need to make our elections more resilient and to make sure voters don't have to risk their health to cast their ballots. We must do this because, as we have seen over the last several weeks, not all States are doing everything they can to protect voters. That is sad, but it is true.

What is coming before us in the fall is a national election. Just yesterday, we learned that the attorney general of Texas has asked the Texas Supreme Court to stop county election officials from letting voters who are afraid of getting the coronavirus to vote by mail. He basically went to court and said that the counties that are giving out these ballots should stop. He tried, he tried, and he is continuing to try to stop them from simply sending out ballots to voters who are afraid to vote in person. Some of them have preexisting conditions. Some of them are veterans who served our country. Some of them are seniors.

Basically, in this one State—by the way, there are other things going on in other States—the attorney general is trying to stop them from actually voting from home. Under Texas law, you have to have an excuse in order to vote by mail.

This pandemic, as we know, has killed more than 85,000 Americans. Local officials in Texas have told the voters that the coronavirus—they have looked at the law and said that it is a valid excuse to request a mail-in ballot. I guess it is. I would think it is. But the Texas attorney general disagrees and has asked the Texas Supreme Court to stop these local election officials from sending voters a mail-in ballot.

That is a disgrace. We shouldn't be playing politics with people's lives.

Even the most cynical Americans believe that. They know people play politics all the time, but they don't think you should play it with their lives.

We know from what happened in Wisconsin that people who show up to vote during this crisis are, in fact, risking their health if precautions are not taken. A little over a month ago, both Democratic and Republican voters and Independent voters in Wisconsin stood for hours in the cold and the rain, wearing garbage bags and homemade masks, in order to cast their votes. There were just 5 polling locations open in Milwaukee instead of the usual 180 and 2 in Green Bay instead of the usual 30, and two-thirds of Wisconsin's African-American voters live in Milwaukee.

There is no question that this vast reduction in polling places, without there being the adequate time to transition to mail-in voting, ended up disenfranchising voters, particularly in the case of African-American voters. At the same time, we saw people trying to vote in whatever way they could. They tried to mail in their ballots even when it was at the last minute.

Now health officials say that more than 67 people in Wisconsin may have become infected with the coronavirus as a result of that election. This is unacceptable. No one should have to choose between exercising the right to vote and protecting the health of themselves and their loved ones. What happened in Wisconsin will be forever etched in the memory of our Nation. We can't allow this to happen again.

In the face of this, yesterday, the Wisconsin Supreme Court actually struck down the Governor's stay-at-home order.

We should actually be taking steps forward now instead of backward. Public health experts have warned of the possibility of another, more serious outbreak of this virus in the fall. Congress must act now to give States the funding they need. We know the States are strapped—that every single State in this country is strapped.

Even if we were to do nothing here, we would know there are going to be States that are going to get humongous requests for mail-in ballots that they have never gotten before. We know that in the State of Wisconsin, Senator JOHNSON's State. It is traditionally a State in which about 6 percent of the people vote by mail. Next-door, in my home State of Minnesota, it is 25 percent. Yes, it is more, but we know it is probably going to at least double—and more—no matter what party you are in.

This is why the Republican Governors are asking for money. They may not agree with everything in my bill, but so many of them are asking for funding to be able to help them send out those ballots and send out the postage so as to keep their polling places open, say, for 1 week, 2 weeks, or, we think, 20 days in advance so that people could actually vote and not con-

gregate in one location. That is why this is happening right now.

Nearly 2 months ago, I introduced legislation, the Natural Disaster and Emergency Ballot Act, with Senator WYDEN, along with 35 of my colleagues. The bill would simply ensure that every voter could cast a ballot by mail, that those who need it could have expanded access to early in-person voting, and that States could have the funding and resources that are necessary to safely administer elections.

This week, the House introduced the COVID 4 bill, the fourth COVID relief package, the HEROES Act. It contains the election reforms found in my legislation as well as \$3.6 billion to help States protect our elections from COVID-19. That is because mailing mail-in ballots all over the country is going to cost some change. We know that. Yet what is the alternative? Is it telling veterans who served on the battlefield in World War II, like the one I heard about yesterday, that they can't vote or that they have to stand in line? What is the alternative—telling seniors they have to stand in line? No, that is not a good alternative. The alternative is to make sure we expand mail-in ballots.

I know negotiations will occur over the coming days regarding the next relief package. I look forward to working with my Democratic and Republican colleagues.

I see the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration is here, Senator BLUNT. I look forward to working with him just as we have recently done on remote committee hearings, which have actually, by all accounts, gone pretty well in the Senate over the last few weeks.

I am here today to push for a change that we know needs to be done, and that is to make some changes to make sure the first grouping of money we got—the \$400 million of emergency funding in the first bill—can get out to the States, because of some changes that were made to the original proposal that have made it hard for some of our States to be able to get that money out. There is a matching requirement, and we see it already playing out. Utah and Oklahoma have indicated they will only be able to access a portion of the funding they have been provided because they can't come up with the full matching requirement. Florida has not yet accessed the funds at all because it is working to see if its legislature can accommodate the matched funding.

These are all things we have to work on for this forthcoming legislation, as well as to look at what we did in the first package. There are also issues with the reporting requirements in the bill, but the last thing we want to do is to put an undue burden on the States.

What I really want to focus on now, at the end of my remarks, is the need to pass the legislation in front of us—and I know it will be negotiated—to make sure that we fund and help our

States fund our elections. Let's dispel the notion that voting at home is somehow a partisan issue. One of the States with the highest number of mail-in ballots is the State of Utah. It is not exactly a bright-blue State. Another State that has a very high number of people voting from home is the State of Colorado. This is a State that tends to be a purple State. Then we have blue States, like Oregon and Washington. Then we have a State like Arizona that, again, has a high number of people voting by mail. On the other end are States that don't have as many people voting by mail, but we have a mixture of States too. New York is at like 5 percent right now. Then we have a number of States, like Alabama, that don't have a lot of people voting by mail.

We don't think—at least I don't think—that every single person is going to vote by mail in the election this November. The key is to give them options and to be able to work with our States so that, if we do provide funding—and I am so hopeful that we will be able to come to some kind of agreement here—they can use that money to expand their votes by mail, because we know their citizens are going to request it, and also to make sure voting on election day will be safe. There are ways to do that by encouraging more people, if they don't want to vote by mail, to vote early so fewer people will be there on the same day.

What do we see when we look at this? A recent poll shows that in some of the key States across the country, both Republican and Democratic voters—70 to 80 percent of them—want to be able to vote by mail. We have Governors in States like New Hampshire—Republican Governors—in Maryland, and in Ohio who want to vote by mail. That is the way they want to go. We have a secretary of state who is a Republican in the State of Washington who wants to vote by mail. Her entire State basically votes by mail right now, and they are good people who can talk about why this is working for them and how we can make it work but only if they have the funds. We are not going to be able to give them the funds in, say, October and then be able to make sure this has happened.

In conclusion, 17 States still have Presidential primaries, and numerous others have primaries for other Federal offices, and, of course, we have the general election on November 3, which is less than 6 months away. We cannot let more Americans experience what we have just seen happen in Wisconsin with the garbage bags, with the homemade masks, with the people getting off work at the hospitals and standing in line. Nobody should have to choose between one's health and one's right to vote.

I am committed to securing additional funding in the upcoming relief package, but we have fixes that we must make to the original funding that we made in the first bill, in the first

piece of legislation, and we need to get that money out to our election officials today.

For these reasons, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a bill at the desk to modify the provisions on funding for election security grants. I further ask that the bill be considered read three times 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 Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, there are many things that the Senator from Minnesota spoke to that I think most of us would agree with.

This COVID crisis has created all kinds of issues that need to be thoroughly discussed and thoroughly debated. I think there are a number of us on this side of the aisle—I am just one standing up—who object to this unanimous consent request. The good news for the Senator from Minnesota is, in talking with those colleagues, they also agree there is a fair number of elements in this bill with which they could probably find agreement.

I rise to certainly extend my hand in cooperation with the Senator from Minnesota. Let's work on these things together, although this is not a bill that comes through my committee's jurisdiction. I can say, in my committee, we work across the aisle. Staff does an awful lot of work, and we come to a conclusion. If it is not ready for a particular markup, we go back and get the work done. We frequently pass a piece of legislation by voice vote and then bring it to the floor when it has all been ironed out. There is no disagreement, and there is no objection, and we pass those bills by unanimous consent.

I think the problem here is that this bill has never had any kind of committee markup or any committee work whatsoever. So I would just suggest that the Senator from Minnesota work with her committee and her committee chair. I see the committee chair is here in the Chamber. Work on this. Try to find those areas of agreement. Then maybe we could pass this and maybe potentially pass this by unanimous consent. This piece of legislation is not ready. It hasn't gone through that process. As a result, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's words in that he is willing to work with me on this bill.

We know we need the immediate fixes to the first piece of legislation, but we also need to look forward to what we have in front of us. That is to make sure that we help our States to be able to conduct their elections in a safe way so that Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—anyone who

wants to vote, whatever party one is in—is able to safely vote.

Let's remember that, while people were lining those streets to vote in Wisconsin, the President of the United States was able to request a mail-in ballot from Palm Beach, FL, and vote in the comfort of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. That is an image—a split screen—that I don't think anyone wants to see. I think what we want to see is fairness for all Americans. You do that by getting them the funding ahead of time, by making sure we have rules in place that work for everyone, by acknowledging this has never been nor should it be a partisan issue, and by telling all Americans that we have worked this out, that we are getting the funding to the States, that we are working with all of their States, and that we have put in some fair rules so that no American will be denied the right to vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this is National Police Week. It is one of the weeks that I always look forward to.

For years now, it has been an opportunity to spend time with people who protect us—who protect all of us. We get a chance each day to say thank you to the Capitol Police, who work here at the Capitol. As the chairman of the Law Enforcement Caucus, I have lots of opportunities in our State to see officers in groups and one at a time, and I always try to be thankful to them when I see them. Yet this is a time every year when we get a chance to see people from all over the country come to Washington, and it is a chance for us to say thank you to them and thank you to their families.

This year in particular, Chief Jon Belmar—the just recently retiring chief at the St. Louis County Police Department and good friend who was always there for advice, always brought a big contingent of officers to Police Week. So I am thinking about him and of not seeing him at Police Week in Washington.

I am also thinking about the new chief of the St. Louis County Police Department, Chief Mary Barton. This is a county of over a million people, so it is a substantial job. It is a place to really affect how police work is done. I look forward to spending time with Chief Barton as she moves forward with what she can do to build on what has happened in the department over the years.

Like so much else this year, Police Week is different than it has been before. There are no sounds of hundreds of motorcycles going down the streets of Washington as we celebrate the week. There are no groups of law enforcement officers or police vehicles from all over the country coming here. I am grateful for them. They protect

our safety. This is a job wherein, every day when you leave home, you have no idea what events may come before you that day, and, frankly, your family has no idea what may happen that day.

I have told a number of officers, in thinking about their families, including the officers who serve here at the Capitol, that they generally have some sense as to whether they are in a moment that could lead to danger or not beyond the normal readiness to serve us but that their families, with their not being with them when they are at work, have to wonder over and over again during the day what threat may come to the person about whom they care so much as that person protects others.

Each year, one of the memorable events of National Police Week is the candlelight vigil that is held at the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial a few blocks from here. We gather there annually to hear the names of officers who have lost their lives and to bear witness to and be grateful for their service.

Sadly, in the past year, Missouri has lost three dedicated officers.

Last June, Lakeshire Chief of Police Wayne Neidenberg passed away after assisting at the scene of a rollover crash in O'Fallon, MO. Chief Neidenberg had stopped at the scene on his way home, called for assistance, and proceeded on after the situation was stabilized, but before he got out of his car at home, he had a heart attack. We lost Chief Neidenberg at that moment.

He spent his entire career in law enforcement. He served in both the St. Louis County Police Department and in the Lakeshire Police Department. He was an Army veteran. He is survived by Ardell, his wife; Cori, his daughter; and his three sons, Matthew, Darek, and Aaron.

On Sunday, June 23, North County Police Cooperative Officer Michael Langsdorf responded to a complaint of check fraud at a local business in Wellston, MO. The man who has been charged with his murder shot Officer Langsdorf after a struggle inside the store. He had served with the department for only 3 months, but before that, for 17 years, he had been part of the St. Louis City Metropolitan Police force.

At his memorial service, Officer Langsdorf's son, Kaleb, remembered his dad this way:

They say never to meet your heroes because you'll end up disappointed. Well, I had the chance to be raised by mine, and he never disappointed. He taught me that a life of rescuing, defending and serving is the only life worth living.

In addition to Kaleb, Officer Langsdorf is survived by Kim, his fiancée; by Olivia, his daughter; and by his future stepchildren, Devin and Kaitlyn.

Officer Christopher Walsh joined the Springfield Police Department in 2016. On the evening of Sunday, March 15 of

this year, Officer Walsh responded to an active shooter situation at a convenience store. The shooter had opened fire in the store, killing three people and injuring a fourth person. Officer Walsh rushed into harm's way to protect others. The shooter opened fire on Officer Walsh and killed him. His fellow officer, Josiah Overton, was injured in the same attack. Officer Walsh was fatally wounded and died the next day.

He was a U.S. Army Reservist. During his 14 years of service in the Reserves, he completed tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. Sheri, his wife, and Morgan, their daughter, will live with his loss for the rest of their lives.

Let me share a passage from Chris's obituary. Chris, by the way, was the first Springfield officer of the town I live in to be killed on duty since the 1930s. It is a great city with the great, good fortune of its officers' managing to do their jobs without having a loss like this, but we had one this year.

The quote from his obituary reads:

Christopher Ryan Walsh, a man devoid of vanity and devoted to the service and to the welfare of others, would hope that out of these tragic circumstances something beautiful could take root in all of our hearts. Chris would hope that his memory would serve as an example to spur small kindnesses and acts of devotion and service to all of our community, friends and loved ones, to look past the things that separate us and to focus on the things that unite us.

So Police Week is exactly the time to think about the things that unite us, to think about these officers and their courage, to think about their acts of devotion and service as we remember them.

Congress wants to make sure that law enforcement officers have the support they need and never get into a situation without the resources needed to back them up. I am honored to serve as cochairman of the bipartisan Senate Law Enforcement Caucus, which advances legislation that supports the efforts of law enforcement nationwide. Senator COONS from Delaware is the other founder and cochair.

Together, we sponsored the National Law Enforcement Museum Commemorative Coin Act that became law last year. The proceeds of the sales from those coins minted under the law would go to education and outreach about the service and sacrifice of law enforcement officers throughout our country's history.

I am also a cosponsor of legislation that would provide resources to protect officers' mental and physical well-being, including the Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act and the Lifesaving Gear for Police Act. I am glad to be a cosponsor of the Thin Blue Line Act and the Back the Blue Act, both of which are designed to better protect police officers and hold perpetrators who attack them accountable. Through these pieces of legislation and several others, the Congress has a chance to once again show its support of the men and women who serve in law enforcement.

Police Week is different this year. I think we are all particularly appreciative of how law enforcement is having to step up in the crisis of the virus, doing what needs to be done, and again often making way for first responders and others to do what they can to save life and to protect other people who somehow are on the edges of this virus. They deal with people who are isolated in their homes, and because they are isolated, their mental health issues have become bigger issues. This is not an easy time for any of those who serve.

Every year, we remember law enforcement, but this year I think we need to be particularly grateful for those who serve and protect us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 564.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Scott H. Rash, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Scott H. Rash, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, John Barrasso, Deb Fischer, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Rob Portman, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 640.

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

The clerk will report the nomination. The bill clerk read the nomination of James E. Trainor III, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2023.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of James E. Trainor III, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, John Barrasso, Deb Fischer, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Rob Portman, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 600.

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

The clerk will report the nomination. The bill clerk read the nomination of Anna M. Manasco, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Anna M. Manasco, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, John Barrasso, Deb Fischer, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Rob Portman, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Cindy

Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 601.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John F. Heil III, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Northern, Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John F. Heil III, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Northern, Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, John Barrasso, Deb Fischer, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Rob Portman, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 602.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John Leonard Badalamenti, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John Leonard Badalamenti, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, John Barrasso, Deb Fischer, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Rob Portman, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO THE KENTUCKY DERBY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as spring begins to give way to summer, there is a singular tradition that unites everyone from across my home State. Even after particularly contentious college basketball seasons, Kentuckians of all backgrounds can look with pride to the Twin Spires of Churchill Downs for the Kentucky Derby. Since 1875, the pride of Louisville has been inextricably linked to the "Most Exciting Two Minutes in Sports."

This year, however, fans couldn't gather at the Grandstands, the infield, or at a Derby Party. The coronavirus pandemic has changed the daily lives of nearly every American. Even our most sacred traditions have been put on hold as we follow the advice of medical experts to slow the spread of this terrible virus. As a result, the Kentucky Derby has been postponed for the first time since the Second World War. The 146th Run for the Roses will instead take place over Labor Day weekend in September.

Jerry Brewer, a Kentucky native and Washington Post sports writer, put into words the sense of longing felt by so many Kentuckians. In a wonderful column published on what would have

been Derby weekend, Jerry shared both his personal reflections and our shared emotions. In Louisville, the Derby is more than a single race. Kentuckians spend the weeks before celebrating our people and our heritage. I am grateful that someone with such eloquence could describe Kentucky's Derby passion.

That is not to say horseracing fans weren't treated to a race on May 2. Instead of hosting the world's most anticipated horse race, Churchill Downs created a virtual running of Triple Crown winners. In a match of some of horseracing's biggest names, Secretariat—one of the greatest horses to ever run—completed an all-star victory.

Although a lot will be different about the Labor Day Derby, so much of what makes the Kentucky Derby special will remain the same. Whether at the track or watching from home, fans will still get to sip a mint julep filled with Kentucky's signature spirit. Longtime residents and first-time visitors alike will feel the sentimental tug as they sing "My Old Kentucky Home." And the thundering hooves of thoroughbreds will echo in the ears of millions.

The postponement is certainly a disappointment, but I would encourage my fellow Kentuckians not to despair. Our traditions are rooted deeply in the Bluegrass. We will beat this virus, and Kentucky will get the chance to shine once again. Like the champions whose names surround Churchill Downs, Kentucky has the strength and grit to overcome any obstacle and cross the finish line.

We may not have a 146th Kentucky Derby champion for a few more months, but I think Jerry Brewer would agree, it is worth the wait.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jerry Brewer's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 2020]

ON DERBY-LESS WEEKEND, MISSING MY
KENTUCKY HOME
(By Jerry Brewer)

A Kentuckian's most humbling Kentucky Derby story: About 15 years ago, I hosted Washington Post colleague Rick Maese, then with the Baltimore Sun, for his first Run for the Roses. Picked him up from the airport. Bought us tickets to a concert that week featuring Common and the Roots. Probably had a mint julep and slice of Derby pie waiting in the cupholder. I was thrilled to show him Louisville at its proudest time.

On the drive to my apartment, Rick looked out the window and saw a man who was walking clumsily, perhaps drunkenly, while pulling a dog that was missing a leg. The scene was cruel, heartbreaking, ridiculous. It was Rick's first impression of my state.

And that's usually how we are: Mostly rural, largely odd and shockingly complicated. Our long-standing problems with big issues such as race and education are well documented. We're weird. We see blue in grass. We love basketball more than we love people. We are known for keeping it real

hick, and as much as we despise that stereotype, part of us plays along because it helps the beauty of Kentucky remain a secret, never to be swarmed and overtaken by careless outsiders.

But during Derby week, that mentality shifts. We want to shine. Louisville—the only city in the state that feels like a big city (when it actually claims its relationship to Kentucky)—becomes the most gracious host that any sporting event has ever had. Don't challenge me on that; I can wield a mean pitchfork. When it comes to tailoring every inch of an area to ensure an unforgettable experience for all visitors, Louisville rolls out a red carpet and throws rose petals at your feet.

Rick shook off that weird introduction and loved his first Derby experience. He has been back several times. When I started dating my wife seriously, I took her to the Derby; meeting the entire family was a mere afterthought. As a Paducah native who lived in Louisville for several years, there is no greater personal holiday than the first Saturday in May. And so, as the novel coronavirus pandemic keeps us in isolation, there is no stronger sense of loss for me than what I'm experiencing right now.

I have attended 11 Derbies. I have partied during the Derby for just about all 42 of my years. My childhood memories are full of gatherings at my grandparents' house in east Louisville, where the scent of mint was more welcome than pine at Christmastime. My adult memories are even better, from trying to cover the event as poetically as the sportswriting legends I grew up reading to, well, acting a fool in the infield during my college days.

Even in Kentucky, with its beautiful rolling hills and horse farms, this is a niche sport. Everyone is a Kentucky Derby fan, though. Our connection to this event is a very powerful and emotional thing.

Derby week is so grand, and we delight in sharing all of the festivities with the world while fighting to keep the Kentucky Oaks—the illustrious Grade I stakes race for 3-year-old fillies held the day before the Derby—a more local event. But over the past 20 years, even the Oaks crowd has surpassed 100,000 with regularity.

Still, the fancy affair turns intimate when "My Old Kentucky Home" plays before the Derby. We wait all year just to feel alive and relevant in that moment. Soon after, the most anticipated two minutes in sports conclude, and before you know it, the time to clean up and plan anew has arrived.

I like the fleeting nature of this joy. The Derby is our cherry blossom. Wait, wait, wait, revel. Go back to waiting. It's deflating to know the wait will be much longer this time.

The 146th Kentucky Derby has been rescheduled for Sept. 5. Churchill Downs announced Thursday that its spring meet will open May 16. Fans won't be able to attend, but the plan is to start racing again. There's something even emptier about the thought of horses competing in a bubble than human athletes.

And who knows if even that is safe enough? Everything about the resumption of normalcy comes back to this: We are at the mercy of a virus that we are still trying to understand. So the odds of this Derby really being the Derby in September—with 150,000 fans flaunting their style, understanding of color and taste in hats—seem long. If it happens, it may play decently on television, but it won't be the same.

To me, the Kentucky Derby is a homecoming with a paisley bow tie wrapped around it. We get the floor, and we make it the most majestic floor you have ever seen. Home can be cringeworthy, but it's also

swanky and magnificent. We clean up good for y'all, but mostly we clean up good for us.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Senator ALEXANDER's opening statement that he delivered yesterday at the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

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

COVID-19: SAFELY GETTING BACK TO WORK AND BACK TO SCHOOL

Mr. Alexander. The Committee on HELP will please come to order. First, some administrative matters based on the advice of the Attending Physician and the Sergeant at Arms after consulting with the Department of Health and Human Services and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Individuals in the hearing room are seated 6 feet apart. As a result, there is no room for the public to attend in person. Representatives of the press are working as a pool to relay their observations to colleagues. The hearing may be watched live on-line. An unedited recording will be available on the Committee's website—www.help.senate.gov.

Witnesses are participating by videoconference in a one-time exception. Some senators, including the chairman, are participating by videoconference. Senators may remove their masks to talk into the microphone since they are all six feet apart. I am grateful to the Rules Committee, Sergeant at Arms, the press gallery, the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police, and our committee staff, Chung Shek and Evan Griffiths, for all of their hard work to help keep all of us safe.

At our hearing last Thursday, I said that all roads back to work and back to school lead through testing and that what our country has done so far on testing so far is "impressive but not nearly enough." Over the weekend, Sen. Schumer, the Democrat leader, was nice enough to put out a tweet quoting half of what I said. He left out the other half, the "impressive" part. So let me say it again in more specific terms.

When I said "impressive," I meant that, according to Johns Hopkins University, the United States has tested over 9 million Americans for COVID-19. That is twice as many as any other country—we don't know what China has done—and more per capita than most countries including South Korea, which several committee members have cited as an example of a country doing testing well.

According to Dr. Deborah Birk, the U.S. will double its testing during the month of May and be able to do at least 10 million tests per month. Here is what "impressive" means in Tennessee: First, anyone who is sick, or a first responder or a health care worker can get tested. Next, Governor Bill Lee is also testing every prisoner, every resident and staff member of a nursing home, offered weekend drive-thru testing, and has done specific outreach to increase testing in low income neighborhoods. A Tennessean can get a free test and a free mask at the local public health clinic. The governor's slogan is: "If in doubt, get a test."

Gov. Lee sent his testing goals for May to the federal government, as every state has done. The federal government will help make sure the state has the supplies it needs if the labs and hospitals in our state have trouble getting them through the usual commercial

channels. Tennessee has tested 4 percent of its population. The governor hopes to increase that to 7 percent by the end of May. That impressive level of testing is sufficient to begin phase I of going back to work in Tennessee, but as I said last week, it is not nearly enough to provide confidence to 31,000 students and faculty that it is safe to return to the University of Tennessee Knoxville campus in August.

Last week I talked with UT Knoxville Chancellor Donde Plowman about what might persuade UT students and 20 million other college students or parents of 50 million K-12 students that it is safe to leave their homes and return to 5,000 college campuses and 100,000 public schools in August. That is where the new shark tank, or RAD X, at the National Institutes of Health that we heard about at our hearing last Thursday comes in. Swimming around in that shark tank are dozens of early stage proposals for new ways to create diagnostic tests.

Three weeks ago, Congress gave NIH \$1.5 billion to create a competitive environment in which Dr. Francis Collins, the distinguished scientist who directs NIH, can search for a few new ideas that can create millions more tests by August and even millions more by the Fall flu season. Congress gave BARDA another \$1 billion to coordinate the manufacture and scaling up rapidly simple tests with quick results.

For example, the FDA authorized last week its first diagnostic test using saliva a person provides at home instead of a nose swab or blood. It authorized its first antigen test, like the ones used for flu or strep throat, which involves swabbing the inside of a nose to produce a result in a few minutes.

Another proposal, not yet approved, is to put in your mouth a sort of lollipop that is a sponge, take a photograph of the lollipop with your cell phone and transmit it to a laboratory. If it lights up, you will know you test positive.

Or the university might send students' saliva to a gene sequencing laboratory, which can process thousands of these in one night and report to the university the next day. In all of these cases, if anyone tests positive, that student or faculty member will be asked to self-isolate for two weeks, and the rest of the student body can continue their education. The same screening test might be repeated in two or four weeks. That same process could occur at a middle school or factory or in advance of for players in a sporting event.

Of course, anyone testing negative one day could test positive the next. But such widespread screening of entire campuses, schools or places of work would help to identify those who are sick and to track down and quarantine those who are exposed. That in turn, should help to persuade parents and students that it is safe to leave home and go back to school.

In addition to more testing by August, I expect Dr. Fauci to tell us about additional treatments available to reduce the risk of death from COVID-19 and about the administration's plan to do something never done before by this country—start mass manufacturing a vaccine before you know for sure that it works.

Vaccines and treatments are the ultimate solutions. But until we have them, all roads back to work and back to school go through testing. The more tests we conduct, the better we can identify the small number of those who are sick and track those who they have had contact with. Then we can quarantine the sick and exposed instead of trying to quarantine the entire country with disastrous effects on our economic wellbeing. This will require millions more new tests, many of them new technologies. Some of these will

fail. But we only need a few successes to create millions more tests.

That is why I said last Thursday that what our country has done so far in testing is impressive, but not nearly enough. First, squeeze all the extra tests out of current technologies. But then create new technologies to produce millions more tests to identify and isolate those who are sick and persuade the rest of us it is safe to go back to work and back to school.

This is a bipartisan oversight hearing to examine how well we are preparing the country to go safely back to work and to school and to determine what more we need to do. Such an exercise sometimes encourages finger pointing. Who did what wrong? Before we spend too much time finger pointing, I would like to suggest that almost all of us—the United States and every country—underestimated this virus. Underestimated how contagious it would be. How it can travel silently without causing symptoms. How it can be especially deadly among certain segments of the population, including the elderly, those with pre-existing conditions, and minority populations.

At the committee's March 3 hearing on coronavirus—six weeks after the first case had arrived in this country, when there were only two deaths in the US from coronavirus—I read this paragraph from the front page of the March 1 Sunday New York Times: Much about the coronavirus remains unclear, and it is far from certain that the outbreak will reach severe proportions in the United States or affect many regions at once. With its top-notch scientists, modern hospitals and sprawling public health infrastructure, most experts agree, the United States is among the countries best prepared to prevent or manage such an epidemic.

A lot of effort has gone into trying to make the United States among the best prepared nations. Over 20 years, the last four Presidents and several Congresses—in response to 9/11, bird flu, Katrina, SARS, H1N1, MERS, and Ebola—passed 9 significant laws that created or contributed to the public health preparedness and response framework we have today.

These 9 laws stood up the Strategic National Stockpile, created an assistant secretary for preparedness and response, provided incentives for the development and manufacturing of diagnostics, vaccines, and medicines, strengthened the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and created the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA). Thanks to the leadership of Sen. Blunt and Sen. Murray, Congress increased funding to the National Institutes of Health for five straight years.

All of this was part of a shared goal—Democrats and Republicans, Congresses and four Presidents—to advance our ability to respond to public health threats, whether known, like anthrax, or emerging, like COVID-19, and they incorporated lessons learned from public health emergencies at the time. But despite all that effort, even the experts underestimated COVID-19.

This hearing is about how we improve our response now and in the fall when this virus is expected to return. During our oversight hearing today and future hearings, I also intend to focus on the next pandemic: What can we learn from this one to be ready for the next one, which will surely come? Can we learn from the current fast tracking of tests, treatments and vaccines how to make them available even more rapidly next time? How to keep hospitals and states from selling off masks and other protective equipment in between crises because of tight budgets. How to make sure Congress funds our share of the responsibility? How to provide enough extra hospital beds without canceling elective sur-

geries, hurting other patients and bankrupting hospitals. Whose job should it be to coordinate supply lines so that protective equipment, supplies, and medicines are available and delivered to where they need to be, when they are needed? How can the stockpile be managed better and what should be in it?

My preacher once said: "I'm not worried about you on Sunday, it's what you do during the rest of the week." I'm afraid that during the rest of the week—between pandemics—we relax our focus on preparedness. We become preoccupied with other important things. Our collective memory is short. Just three months ago the country was consumed with impeaching a President. Now that seems like ancient Roman history. Now, while this crisis has our full attention, I believe we should put into law this year whatever improvements we need to be well prepared for the next one. If there is to be finger pointing, I hope fingers will point in that direction.

We are fortunate today to have four distinguished witnesses who are at the heart of the response to the coronavirus crisis. I have asked each to summarize his remarks in five minutes. Then we will have a five minute round of questions. I have agreed that we will end our hearing at 12:30, which will permit one full round of questions. Sen. Murray will have the opportunity to ask an additional question before we close and all senators will be able to submit questions for the record. There will be other hearings to follow last Thursday's hearing on testing and this one.

Staying at home indefinitely is not the way to end this pandemic. There is not enough money available to help all those hurt by a closed economy. All roads back to work and back to school lead through testing, tracking, isolation, treatment, and vaccines. This requires widespread testing—millions more tests created mostly by new technologies—to identify those who are sick and who have been exposed so they can be quarantined and, by containing the disease in this way, give the rest of America enough confidence to leave their homes. For the near term, to help make sure those 31,000 UT students and faculty show up in August, we need widespread testing—millions more tests created mostly by new technologies—to identify those who are sick and who have been exposed so they can be quarantined and, by containing the disease in this way, give the rest of America enough confidence to go back to work and back to school.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the bravery and dedication of our Nation's law enforcement personnel. Even under normal circumstances, police officers put their lives on the line every day to defend our communities; now, as our country struggles through an unprecedented public health crisis, policemen and women are taking on even more personal risk to keep Americans safe. They deserve our wholehearted gratitude and respect.

I am proud to cosponsor Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator GRAHAM's resolution designating May 10 through May 16 as National Police Week and emphasizing our support for the law enforcement officers across the United States who work to preserve our safety and security. The resolution also pays respect to the many police officers who

tragically fell in the line of duty in the last year, including Officer Kyle David Olinger of the Montgomery County, MD, Police Department.

Officer Olinger served with the Montgomery County Police Department for 2 years and had previously served with the Reading Police Department for 6 years. On April 18, 2019, Officer Olinger succumbed to complications of a gunshot wound he sustained on August 13, 2003, while making a traffic stop at the intersection of Second Avenue and Spring Street in Silver Spring. He observed one of the passengers in vehicle attempting to conceal a handgun underneath the seat. He ordered the man to drop the weapon before a struggle ensued. The man shot Officer Olinger in the neck, injuring his spinal column. The subject and the three other occupants drove away but were all apprehended a short time later. The man who shot him was convicted of attempted murder and subsequently sentenced to life in prison. Officer Olinger was paralyzed below his chest because of the shooting. He was married and had two sons. We will not forget his courage and the courage of his brothers and sisters on the force.

Police officers around the country have devoted their lives to protecting us, and we must do everything within our power to protect them, too. During the COVID-19 pandemic, that means ensuring that all law enforcement officers have the equipment, training, and resources they need to stay safe while they continue their duties. Even though there is an extremely contagious and dangerous virus spreading all over the U.S., police forces cannot simply stop responding to crimes and emergencies. Policewomen and men, like healthcare providers and other essential workers, face a higher risk of contracting the coronavirus so that the rest of us can be safe and healthy. As of May 11, 2020, 101 officers have died from COVID-19. The least we can do is try to mitigate the risk that they face and save as many law enforcement lives as possible.

There are concrete steps that we can and must take to safeguard our Nation's police officers during this epidemic. First and foremost, it is critical that we make the required personal protective equipment—PPE—and testing universally available to the police. I have heard heartwarming stories about communities in Maryland donating PPE to their local police stations, but the bottom line is that public citizens should not need to take on that responsibility. The government should ensure that law enforcement agencies have the tools and equipment they need to perform their duties safely, especially during a period of increased risk like this one. I hope that we will significantly expand funding to State and local governments in upcoming coronavirus legislation so that they have the means to do so.

Unfortunately, even with added protective measures, there will still be law

enforcement officers who contract COVID-19 in the line of duty. We owe those brave men and women support to recover medically and financially from this disease. That means that we need to make workers compensation and comprehensive healthcare, both physical and mental, fully accessible to police officers and men whom COVID-19 has affected. We also need to recognize that serving as a police officer is much more dangerous now than it was 6 months ago, and it should be compensated accordingly; law enforcement officers deserve hazard pay for putting themselves in harm's way during this pandemic in order to keep our communities safe.

Of course, we need to work not just during National Police Week and not just during this health crisis but year-round to show law enforcement officers our gratitude. We must do everything we can to protect them in the line of duty and care for them when their service causes them harm. I will continue fighting to support the heroes who bravely risk their own security to make this country a safer place for all of us.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, each day, our peace officers prepare for work with no guarantee of what the next shift holds. They say goodbye to their loved ones and head out to serve and protect communities throughout Maine and across the country. And unfortunately, on some devastating days, they don't come home. These selfless citizens put themselves in dangerous positions day in and day out to ensure the safety of our people; it is a commitment that evokes awe. They are heroes, walking among us, and when they make the ultimate sacrifice, it is on us to ensure that their names and deeds are not forgotten.

So today, I rise to honor those who have made that sacrifice. This week, we mark National Police Week. This year's observance is, obviously, a bit different than usual. There will be no gathering peace officers from all over the country come to Washington, DC, to honor their fallen brothers and sisters; there will be no in-person candlelight vigil. But though the events are different, the goal is the same: to honor the memory of those who have given so much to protect our communities.

This pandemic will not change our dedication to mourn their loss and honor their service, and this year, we will add 307 names of those who lost their lives in the line of duty to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, including two peace officers from my home State of Maine. I want to take this opportunity to share a little more about the legacies these peace officers leave behind.

First: Detective Benjamin James Campbell of the Maine State Police died in the line of duty on April 3, 2019. Detective Campbell was helping a disabled vehicle in Hampden, ME, when he was struck by a vehicle tire. He was

just 31 years old and leaves behind a wife and young son. He served the Maine State Police since 2012 and was promoted to detective in 2017.

When asked to describe Detective Campbell, Maine State Police Col. John Cote put it simply and strongly, he said Detective Campbell was "one of our very best." One of our very best—that tells you all you need to know about how his colleagues felt about him—an officer who stopped to help someone, a caring man, and a life taken much too soon.

Second, the memorial will include the name of Perley Morrison Sprague, chief of the Rockport Police Department. Sadly, Chief Sprague suffered a major cardiac event on November 15, 1996, and died as a result. A son of Maine, Chief Sprague embodied a life of service. He was born in Bangor in 1948. He was a Coast Guard veteran, serving in Vietnam, and held numerous public safety positions in Maine, including as a member of the Portland Police Department and the Maine Department of Marine Resources, where he served for 21 years and worked his way up to chief of the bureau of the marine patrol. In 1995, he accepted his final position as the Rockport chief of police. Once at Rockport, he was described as a man with new ideas and visions for hiring and training. He lived a life of service, and Maine will never forget him.

As we mourn the loss of these heroes, we must do our part to lift up the loved ones and communities they have left behind. May God bless Detective Campbell, Chief Sprague, and the others around the country who lost their lives. And may God continue to watch over those peace officers who go to work, with no guarantee they will return. They are examples for us all, and Maine will never forget them.

105TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I want to join my friends in the Armenian community in solemnly observing the 105th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. While we could not commemorate the Armenian Genocide in Rhode Island as we normally would due to the pandemic, I know we are united in our belief in the bright future and resilience of the Armenian people.

More than a century ago, one of the worst tragedies of the 20th century began when the Young Turk leaders of the Ottoman Empire executed more than 200 prominent Armenians. What followed was an 8-year campaign of massacre and oppression. By 1923, an estimated one and a half million Armenians were killed and over a half a million survivors were exiled.

These atrocities affected the lives of every Armenian living in Asia Minor and across the globe. The U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire during this dark time, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., unsuccessfully pleaded with President

Wilson to take action and later remembered the events of the Genocide, saying, "I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915."

Those who survived the Armenian Genocide, however, persevered due to their unbreakable spirit. Survivors of the Armenian Genocide contributed greatly to the lands in which they established new homes and communities, including the United States. That is why we not only commemorate this grave tragedy each year, but also take the time to celebrate the traditions and the contributions of the Armenian people. Indeed, my home State of Rhode Island continues to be enriched by our strong and vibrant Armenian-American community.

I was pleased when a resolution to encourage the U.S. to officially recognize the Armenian Genocide passed the Senate in December. We must find a way to come together to recognize the truth of what happened, and support and assist those facing persecution today.

As ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee and a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I also remain committed to supporting assistance to Armenia to strengthen security, promote economic growth, and foster democratic reforms and development.

As we remember the past, we remain committed to forging a brighter future. We must continue to guard against hatred and oppression so that we can prevent such crimes against humanity from happening again.

Thank you.

NEUROFIBROMATOSIS AWARENESS DAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Children's Tumor Foundation is observing May 17, 2020, as neurofibromatosis—NF—Awareness Day to educate the public about this rare genetic disorder that impacts more than 2 million people around the world. It is estimated that 1 in every 3,000 births is diagnosed with NF; yet it is still relatively unknown to the public.

NF affects all populations equally, regardless of race, ethnicity, or gender. The disorder causes tumors to grow on nerves throughout the body and can also affect development of the brain, cardiovascular system, bones, and skin. Further, the disorder can lead to blindness, deafness, bone abnormalities, disfigurement, learning disabilities, disabling pain, and cancer.

The Children's Tumor Foundation leads efforts to promote and financially sponsor world-class medical research aimed at finding effective treatments and, ultimately, a cure for NF. They do this by actively fostering col-

laborative partnerships in both science and industry to speed the drug research and development process through a number of consortia.

In kind, the Children's Tumor Foundation is working around the clock to improve access to quality patient healthcare through its national NF clinic network. It provides patient and family support through its information resources, youth programs, and local chapter activities.

Much remains to be done in raising public awareness of NF to help promote early diagnosis, proper management and treatment, prevention of complications, and support for research.

NF affects children all across the world; and in recognition of this important initiative and the tireless research taking place, I support recognizing May 17, 2020 as Neurofibromatosis Awareness Day.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DARCY SCHINDLER

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Darcy Schindler of Granite County for his tremendous efforts to support his community during the ongoing coronavirus pandemic.

Darcy has been a committed and passionate science teacher over the past 27 years. He joined the teaching ranks at Drummond High School 20 years ago, where he continues to mentor and encourage countless students.

When the coronavirus pandemic began spreading across the country, Darcy was hearing stories from his friends working in the medical and dental fields, that they were having a tough time finding protective masks.

Darcy decided to take action and began volunteering his time and resources to create protective masks for our healthcare heroes and first responders on the frontlines of this ongoing coronavirus pandemic in Montana.

With the school's permission, Darcy used the school's 3D printer to produce the protective masks. With support from those in the community, along with his own time and resources, Darcy has shipped well over 100 masks across Montana. He has not taken any payments for his shipments. He only asks that they instead make a donation to the Drummond Schools Science Fund to help his students.

It is my honor to recognize Darcy Schindler for his efforts to support our healthcare heroes and our first responders. His selflessness and commitment to serve others is an extraordinary example of how Montanans are stepping up in the face of this pandemic to help one another. I thank Darcy Schindler for his efforts to help the Drummond community and communities all across Montana.●

200TH ANNIVERSARY OF OAKLAND COUNTY

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 200th anniversary of my home, Oakland County, MI. Established March 28, 1820, and situated just north of Detroit in southeastern Michigan, Oakland County has, over the past 200 years, transformed from a small rural settlement to a thriving economic hub.

On January 11, 1805, Congress established the Michigan Territory, but nearly a decade later the area remained largely unsettled due to the reputation that it was too wild, even for the heartiest of pioneers. The territory began to modernize and attract settlers under the strong leadership of Governor Lewis Cass, appointed in 1813 by President James Madison as a reward for his military service in the War of 1812. Avon Township, now Rochester and Rochester Hills, became the first area settled in Oakland County thanks to a settlers from New England, New York, and southern Canada. Governor Cass requested the remaining territory carefully surveyed, which revealed a bounty of fertile land ripe for settlement in the area now known as Pontiac. Therefore, on March 28, 1820, Cass established Oakland County and designated the central city of Pontiac—no more than a day's journey from any point in the county—as county seat. In this newly established seat, Cass allocated land to erect a courthouse, jail, cemetery, market, schoolhouse, and several churches. At this time, Oakland County had a population of 330.

It is crucial to recognize the inhabitation and development of the land prior to the arrival of European settlers. Native Americans from the Chipewewa, Ottawa, and Potawatomi Tribes, collectively known as the Anishinaabe, occupied the region for thousands of years prior. Early European explorers to Michigan recorded the Anishinaabe development of the land, noting their key paths and roadways. When forming the county, settlers continued to use and build upon these thoroughfares, many of which still exist to this day. The Shiawassee Trail is now Shiawassee Street in Farmington; Saginaw Trail is part of Dixie Highway; and Grand River Trail is now US 16. The Anishinaabe indisputably shaped the current landscape of Oakland County and its trade and travel routes.

Today, 200 years since Governor Cass established Oakland County, I recognize its transformation from a rural community to the home of 62 cities, townships, and villages, 11 colleges and universities, and a center for industrial and technological development. The economy employs over 650,000 workers, with the largest industries being manufacturing, healthcare and social assistance, and professional, scientific, and technical services. In addition to its robust private sector, Oakland County is

the base for over 11,000 nonprofit organizations. But what truly makes Oakland County unique are the parks, museums, beaches, downtowns, and theaters enjoyed by the diverse population of residents from all backgrounds, faiths, and identities.

As a fifth-generation Michigander living in Oakland County, I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the rich history of the region as well as this significant milestone. I wish Oakland County continued growth and prosperity in the years ahead.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-4531. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019, with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Peter M. McCoy, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Carolina for the term of four years.

William Scott Hardy, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Drew B. Tipton, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

John Peter Cronan, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Thomas T. Cullen, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia.

David Cleveland Joseph, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Jennifer P. Togliatti, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

Stephen Sidney Schwartz, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Kathryn C. Davis, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Vincent F. DeMarco, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York for the term of four 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. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. LOEF-FLER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KING, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 3731. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to provide for a single point of contact at the Social Security Administration for individuals who are victims of identity theft; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 3732. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to further protect officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 3733. A bill to establish the Executive Agent for Declassification to promote programs, processes, and systems and for directing resources relating to declassification in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 3734. A bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 3735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for alternative fuel vehicle refueling property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 3736. A bill to increase access to food delivery under the supplemental nutrition assistance program to address the Coronavirus Disease 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

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

S. 3737. A bill to improve the public health workforce loan repayment program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 3738. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide updated information about COVID-19 testing to

the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 3739. A bill to provide for matching funds waivers for formula grants and subgrants under the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. JONES, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3740. A bill to assist older Americans and people with disabilities affected by COVID-19; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 3741. A bill to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for services furnished via telehealth if such services would be covered if furnished in-person during the COVID-19 emergency; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3742. A bill to establish a program in the Department of the Treasury to allocate funds to States, units of general local government, and Indian Tribes to provide assistance to certain small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3743. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that all firearms are traceable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RISC, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DAINES, Mr. COONS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 3744. A bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China; considered and passed.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3745. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to provide relief to borrowers of student loans for whom the Department of

Education found misrepresentation by the institution of higher education or a State attorney general has asserted a right to borrower defense discharge; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3746. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include certain employment as a health care practitioner as eligible for public service loan forgiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3747. A bill to help charitable nonprofit organizations provide services to meet the increasing demand in community needs caused by the coronavirus pandemic, preserve and create jobs in the nonprofit sector, reduce unemployment, and promote economic recovery; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PERDUE, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. LOEFFLER):

S. 3748. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dust Off crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and life-saving actions in Vietnam; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 3749. A bill to protect the privacy of health information during a national health emergency; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 3750. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the accelerated and advance payment programs under parts A and B of the Medicare program during the COVID-19 emergency; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 578. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms.

ROSEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CARPER):

S. Res. 579. A resolution encouraging the international community to remain committed to collaboration and coordination to mitigate and prevent the further spread of COVID-19 and urging renewed United States leadership and participation in any global efforts on therapeutics and vaccine development and delivery to address COVID-19 and prevent further deaths, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 580. A resolution condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 581. A resolution honoring the memory of Jereima "Jeri" Bustamante on the second anniversary of her passing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 827

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 827, a bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to provide for the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall of the names of the lost crew members of the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans killed on June 3, 1969.

S. 1257

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1257, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts to include rollovers for charitable life-income plans for charitable purposes.

S. 1620

At the request of Mr. KING, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1620, a bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to exempt from inspection the slaughter of animals and the preparation of

carcasses conducted at a custom slaughter facility, and for other purposes.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2539, a bill to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 2999

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2999, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with direct primary care service arrangements to remain eligible individuals for purposes of health savings accounts.

S. 3302

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3302, a bill to improve global health security, and for other purposes.

S. 3569

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3569, a bill to help small business broadband providers keep customers connected.

S. 3589

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3589, a bill to amend the higher education emergency relief fund under the CARES Act to restrict eligibility to institutions of higher education that owned endowment assets whose average monthly value was equal to or less than \$10,000,000,000 in 2019, unless the institution expends additional institutional funds on higher education emergency relief.

S. 3596

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3596, a bill to make technical corrections to the CARES Act to remove all tax liability associated with loan forgiveness under the Paycheck Protection Program.

S. 3599

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3599, a bill to enhance our Nation's nurse and physician workforce during the COVID-19 crisis by recapturing unused immigrant visas.

S. 3650

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from California

(Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3650, a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to deem employees of urban Indian organizations as part of the Public Health Service for certain purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 3652

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3652, a bill to allow 2020 recovery rebates with respect to qualifying children over the age of 16 and other dependents.

S. 3653

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 3653, a bill to allow tax credits to State and local governments for required paid sick leave and required paid family and medical leave.

S. 3665

At the request of Mrs. LOEFFLER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3665, a bill to amend the title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rural health care by ensuring fairness in Medicare hospital payments.

S. 3696

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3696, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disregard additional unemployment compensation for purposes of premium tax credit and cost-sharing subsidies, and for other purposes.

S. 3706

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3706, a bill to allow Federal law enforcement officers to purchase retired service weapons, and for other purposes.

S. 3725

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3725, a bill to expand vote by mail and early voting, and to improve the safety, accessibility, and efficiency of in-

person voting during elections for Federal office.

S. RES. 78

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 78, a resolution recognizing the national debt as a threat to national security.

S. RES. 533

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 533, a resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 3735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for alternative fuel vehicle refueling property; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the Securing America's Clean Fuels Infrastructure Act, which I am introducing today with my good friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee. Our legislation would improve and expand the existing Alternative Fuel Vehicle Refueling Property Investment Tax Credit, which is commonly known as "30C."

The Securing America's Clean Fuels Infrastructure Act is about giving Americans a real choice when it comes to transportation, and it's about economic opportunity at a time when Americans need it most. On America's roads and highways today, gas stations are rarely farther than the next corner or next exit. That's not necessarily true for cleaner fuels. In order to meet our clean air and climate goals and lead the world in clean vehicle manufacturing, Americans must have greater access to hydrogen refueling and electric charging stations. Our legislation improves upon current tax credits to better incentivize companies to make investments today—rather than later—in the construction of clean fuel vehicle infrastructure nationwide.

Currently, 30C provides a 30 percent investment tax credit for alternative fuel vehicle refueling property, which includes electric charging stations and hydrogen refueling stations. This tax credit expires on December 31, 2020. Today, the 30C investment tax credit, as it is structured and interpreted by the Internal Revenue Service, only allows the credit to be used on a per-location basis rather than on a per-device basis, which means that only one charging station per public parking garage could qualify for the credit. That current structure and interpretation of the credit makes it difficult to finance multiple charging or refueling stations at one location, or to finance expansions of one location in the future. The Securing America's Clean Fuels Infra-

structure Act makes clear that the 30C investment tax credit can be applied to each item of refueling property (such as each charger) rather than per location.

Additionally, the current \$30,000 cap on business investments does not provide adequate support for the installation of today's fast-charging electric vehicle stations or hydrogen refueling stations. The Securing America's Clean Fuels Infrastructure Act increases the 30C investment tax cap for business investments from \$30,000 to \$200,000 for each item of refueling property.

Finally, this legislation will also extend the credit for eight more years, to December 31, 2028, ensuring that the business community has the certainty needed to make long-term investments in clean fuels infrastructure.

Our legislation is a commonsense way Congress can spur economic investments in our nation's aging infrastructure, help reduce transportation pollution, and support the millions of Americans that are considering buying a clean car today or in the future. That is why this bipartisan legislation has won broad support from the business and environmental communities. This is legislation that I commend to my colleagues for their serious consideration.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DAINES, Mr. COONS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 3744. A bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China; considered and passed.

S. 3744

To condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in

Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Statement of purpose.
- Sec. 3. Findings.
- Sec. 4. Sense of Congress.
- Sec. 5. Updating statement of United States policy toward the People’s Republic of China.
- Sec. 6. Imposition of sanctions.
- Sec. 7. Report on human rights abuses in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.
- Sec. 8. Report on protecting citizens and residents of the United States from intimidation and coercion.
- Sec. 9. Report on security and economic implications of repression in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region by the Government of the People’s Republic of China.
- Sec. 10. Classified report.

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to direct United States resources to address human rights violations and abuses, including gross violations of human rights, by the Government of the People’s Republic of China through the mass surveillance and internment of over 1,000,000 Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of the People’s Republic of China has a long history of repressing Turkic Muslims and other Muslim minority groups, particularly Uyghurs, in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. In recent decades, central and regional Chinese government policies have systematically discriminated against these minority groups by denying them a range of civil and political rights, including the freedom of expression, religion, and movement, and the right to a fair trial.

(2) In May 2014, the Government of the People’s Republic of China launched its latest “Strike Hard Against Violent Extremism” campaign, using wide-scale, internationally-linked threats of terrorism as a pretext to justify pervasive restrictions on and serious human rights violations of members of ethnic minority communities in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. The August 2016 appointment of former Tibet Autonomous Region Party Secretary Chen Quanguo to be Party Secretary of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region accelerated the crackdown across the region. Scholars, human rights organizations, journalists, and think tanks have provided ample evidence substantiating the establishment by the Government of the People’s Republic of China of internment camps. Since 2014, the Government of the People’s Republic of China has detained more than 1,000,000 Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in these camps. The total ethnic minority population of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region was approximately 13,000,000 at the time of the last census conducted by the People’s Republic of China in 2010.

(3) The Government of the People’s Republic of China’s actions against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region violate international human rights laws and norms, including—

(A) the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, to which the People’s Republic of China has acceded;

(B) the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which the People’s Republic of China has signed and ratified;

(C) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the People’s Republic of China has signed; and

(D) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(4) Senior Chinese Communist Party officials, including current Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region Party Secretary Chen Quanguo, who executes Chinese government policy in the region, and former Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region Deputy Party Secretary Zhu Hailun, who crafted many of the policies implemented in the region, bear direct responsibility for gross human rights violations committed against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups. These abuses include the arbitrary detention of more than 1,000,000 Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups, separation of working age adults from children and the elderly, and the integration of forced labor into supply chains.

(5) Those detained in internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region have described forced political indoctrination, torture, beatings, food deprivation, and denial of religious, cultural, and linguistic freedoms. These victims have confirmed that they were told by guards that the only way to secure their release was to demonstrate sufficient political loyalty. Poor conditions and lack of medical treatment at such facilities appear to have contributed to the deaths of some detainees, including the elderly and infirm.

(6) Uyghurs and ethnic Kazakhs who have obtained permanent residence or citizenship in other countries report being subjected to threats and harassment from Chinese officials. At least 5 journalists for Radio Free Asia’s Uyghur service have publicly detailed abuses their family members in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region have endured in response to their work exposing the Government of the People’s Republic of China’s abusive policies.

(7) In September 2018, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Michelle Bachelet noted in her first speech as High Commissioner the “deeply disturbing allegations of large-scale arbitrary detentions of Uyghurs and other Muslim communities, in so-called reeducation camps across Xinjiang”.

(8) In 2019, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China concluded that, based on available evidence, the establishment and actions committed in the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region may constitute “crimes against humanity”.

(9) On December 31, 2018, President Donald J. Trump signed into law the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409), which—

(A) condemns the People’s Republic of China’s “forced disappearances, extralegal detentions, invasive and omnipresent surveillance, and lack of due process in judicial proceedings”;

(B) authorizes funding to promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in the People’s Republic of China; and

(C) supports sanctions designations against any entity or individual that—

(i) violates human rights or religious freedoms; or

(ii) engages in censorship activities.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should—

(A) condemn abuses against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, members of other Muslim minority groups, and other persons by authorities of the People’s Republic of China; and

(B) call on such authorities to immediately—

(i) close the internment camps;

(ii) lift all restrictions on, and ensure respect for, human rights; and

(iii) allow people inside the People’s Republic of China to reestablish contact with their loved ones, friends, and associates outside the People’s Republic of China;

(2) the Secretary of State should consider strategically employing sanctions and other tools under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401 et seq.), including measures resulting from the designation of the People’s Republic of China as a country of particular concern for religious freedom under section 402(b)(1)(A)(ii) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)(1)(A)(ii)), that directly address particularly severe violations of religious freedom;

(3) the Secretary of State should—

(A) work with United States allies and partners and through multilateral institutions to condemn the mass arbitrary detention of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) coordinate closely with the international community on targeted sanctions and visa restrictions;

(4) the journalists of the Uyghur language service of Radio Free Asia should be commended for their reporting on the human rights and political situation in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region despite efforts by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to silence or intimidate their reporting through the detention of family members and relatives in China;

(5) the United States should expand the availability of and capacity for Uyghur language programming on Radio Free Asia in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(6) the Federal Bureau of Investigation and appropriate United States law enforcement agencies should take steps to hold accountable officials from the People’s Republic of China or individuals acting on their behalf who harass, threaten, or intimidate persons within the United States; and

(7) United States companies and individuals selling goods or services or otherwise operating in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region should take steps, including in any public or financial filings, to ensure that—

(A) their commercial activities are not contributing to human rights violations in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region or elsewhere in China; and

(B) their supply chains are not compromised by forced labor.

SEC. 5. UPDATING STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

Section 901(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246; 104 Stat. 84) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (8), (9), and (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) United States policy toward the People’s Republic of China should be explicitly linked to the situation in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, specifically as to whether—

“(A) the internment of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in internment camps has ended;

“(B) all political prisoners are released;

“(C) the use of mass surveillance and predictive policing to discriminate against and violate the human rights of members of specific ethnic groups has ceased and is not evident in other parts of China; and

“(D) the Government of the People’s Republic of China has ended particularly severe restrictions of religious and cultural practice in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.”.

SEC. 6. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the President shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that identifies each foreign person, including any official of the Government of the People’s Republic of China, that the President determines is responsible for any of the following with respect to Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, members of other Muslim minority groups, or other persons in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region:

(A) Torture.

(B) Cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

(C) Prolonged detention without charges and trial.

(D) Causing the disappearance of persons by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons.

(E) Other flagrant denial of the right to life, liberty, or the security of persons.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to each foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1).

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of a foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property—

(A) are in the United States;

(B) come within the United States; or

(C) come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is subject to revocation of any visa or other entry documentation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect immediately; and

(II) cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien’s possession.

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a foreign person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if the President determines and certifies to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

(f) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under this section shall not apply to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under subsection (c)(2) shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary—

(A) to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations; or

(B) to carry out or assist law enforcement activity in the United States.

(3) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this section shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) GOOD DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “good” means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(g) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines and reports to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives not later than 15 days before the termination takes effect that—

(1) information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(3) the person has credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior, has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed, and has credibly committed to not engage in an activity described in subsection (a)(1) in the future; or

(4) the termination of the sanctions is in the national security interests of the United States.

(h) SUNSET.—This section, and any sanctions imposed under this section, shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admission”, “admitted”, and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(3) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies and civil society organizations, shall—

(1) submit a report on human rights abuses in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) make the report described in paragraph (1) available on the website of the Department of State.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the number of individuals detained in internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(2) a description of the conditions in such camps for detainees, including, to the extent practicable, an assessment of—

(A) methods of torture;

(B) efforts to force individuals to renounce their faith; and

(C) other serious human rights abuses;

(3) to the extent practicable, an assessment of the number of individuals in the region in forced labor camps;

(4) a description of the methods used by People’s Republic of China authorities to “reeducate” detainees in internment camps, including a list of government agencies of the People’s Republic of China in charge of such reeducation;

(5) an assessment of the use and nature of forced labor in and related to the detention of Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, including a description of foreign companies and industries directly benefitting from such labor;

(6) an assessment of the level of access to Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region granted by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to foreign diplomats and consular agents, independent journalists, and

representatives of nongovernmental organizations;

(7) an assessment of the mass surveillance, predictive policing, and other methods used by the Government of the People's Republic of China to violate the human rights of persons in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(8) a description of the frequency with which foreign governments are forcibly returning Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and other refugees and asylum seekers to the People's Republic of China;

(9) a description, as appropriate, of United States diplomatic efforts with allies and other nations—

(A) to address the gross violations of human rights in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) to protect asylum seekers from the region; and

(10) the identification of the offices within the Department of State that are responsible for leading and coordinating the diplomatic efforts referred to in paragraph (9).

SEC. 8. REPORT ON PROTECTING CITIZENS AND RESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM INTIMIDATION AND COERCION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that outlines all of the efforts to protect United States citizens and residents, including ethnic Uyghurs and Chinese nationals legally studying or working temporarily in the United States, who have experienced harassment or intimidation within the United States by officials or agents of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 9. REPORT ON SECURITY AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF REPRESSION IN XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives on the matters described in subsection (b).

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the national and regional security threats posed to the United States by the policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(2) a description of—

(A) the acquisition or development of technology by the Government of the People's Republic of China to facilitate internment and mass surveillance in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, including technology related to predictive policing and large-scale data collection and analysis; and

(B) the threats that the acquisition, development, and use of such technologies pose to the United States;

(3) a list of Chinese companies that are involved in—

(A) constructing or operating the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; or

(B) providing or operating mass surveillance technology in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(4) a description of the role of the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps in internment and forced labor in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 10. CLASSIFIED REPORT.

The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with such elements of the Intelligence Community as the Director deems appropriate, shall submit a classified report to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that assesses the ability of the United States Government to collect and analyze intelligence regarding—

(1) the scope and scale of the detention and forced labor of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in the People's Republic of China;

(2) the gross violations of human rights perpetrated inside the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(3) other policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region that constitute gross violations of human rights.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3746. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include certain employment as a health care practitioner as eligible for public service loan forgiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an issue of critical importance to California: doctor shortages.

First, I want to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to the entire medical community, particularly the doctors, nurses, and support staff who have been on the frontlines of the coronavirus pandemic. Amidst a severe shortage of protective equipment, they nevertheless continue to work around the clock to save countless lives. I—and my colleagues—are eternally grateful to you.

I have heard from countless Californians who have said the same thing: we need more doctors.

That is why Congress established the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program in 2007 to encourage doctors to pursue careers at public and nonprofit facilities, especially in areas experiencing physician shortages. As a result, physicians who provide care in a nonprofit or public hospital can have their student debt forgiven by the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program after making 120 qualifying monthly payments under a qualifying repayment plan.

However, when the Department of Education issued implementing guidance for the program, it unintentionally excluded California and Texas phy-

sicians from being eligible to receive loan forgiveness. Under state law in California and Texas, doctors are prevented from being directly employed by corporations, including nonprofit organizations. As a result, physicians in California and Texas who provide medical services at nonprofit hospitals do not qualify for the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program.

To make matters worse, the United States is facing a shortage of physicians. According to the Association of American Medical Colleges, our Nation can expect a shortage of up to nearly 122,000 physicians by 2032 as demand for physicians continues to grow. California alone will need an additional 10,000 primary care doctors.

During this difficult and challenging time, it is clear that more medical professionals are needed. And long after this pandemic ends, we will still need more doctors to provide high-quality care, in both rural and urban areas.

That is why I am pleased to introduce the bipartisan “Stopping Doctor Shortages Act.” This legislation would help attract more doctors to public service and address the looming physician shortage by fixing a loophole that prevents thousands of doctors from participating in the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program.

According to the California Medical Association, this bill alone could bring as many as 10,000 physicians to California over the next ten years.

Similar legislation, introduced in the House by Representatives JOSH HARDER, PAUL COOK, JOAQUIN CASTRO, DAN CRENSHAW, and KAREN BASS, also enjoys bipartisan support.

I would like to thank Senators JOHN CORNYN and KAMALA HARRIS for their support on this critical issue and for cosponsoring the bill.

I ask my colleagues to join us to right a wrong and pass the “Stopping Doctor Shortages Act” in a timely manner as we continue to find ways to combat the coronavirus pandemic and save lives.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 578—CONDEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN'S STATE-SPONSORED PERSECUTION OF ITS BAHAI MINORITY AND ITS CONTINUED VIOLATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 578

Whereas in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018, Congress declared that it—

(1) deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community; and

(2) would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith;

Whereas according to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom's 2017 annual report, "Since 1979, [Iranian] authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha'i leaders, and more than 10,000 [Baha'i] have been dismissed from government and university jobs [in Iran]";

Whereas the Report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran (A/74/188), dated July 18, 2019, provides, in part—

(1) the Iranian authorities and the Iranian criminal justice system regard the Baha'is as "unprotected infidels";

(2) "the Baha'i Faith is regarded as a 'misguided sect' and Baha'i worship and religious practices are deemed heresy";

(3) "Baha'is have been murdered with impunity and violations of their human rights have not been investigated";

(4) members of the Baha'i Faith "frequently face charges such as 'breaching national security', 'propaganda against the holy regime of the Islamic Republic of Iran' or 'propaganda activities against the regime in the interests of the Baha'i sect'";

(5) "Since August 2005, more than 1,168 Baha'is have been arrested and charged with vaguely worded offences";

(6) "There were a total of 95 Baha'is reportedly arrested in 2018, compared with at least 84 in 2017 and 81 in 2016";

(7) "On 1 January 2019, the court of appeal of Isfahan reportedly condemned, in separate judgments, nine Baha'i citizens to a total of 48 years of prison. They had been charged with 'membership of the illegal Baha'i community and propaganda against the regime by spreading the Baha'i Faith in the society'";

(8) Since 2007, in response to a letter from the Security Unit of the Public Place Supervision Office of the Islamic Republic of Iran to police commanders throughout the country, Baha'is have been banned from specific professions, to halt their entry into high earning businesses; and

(9) "Since 2013, there have been more than 803 incidents of violations of economic rights of the Baha'is, including arbitrary shop closures, unfair dismissals from employment and the actual or threatened revocation of business licenses";

Whereas the Iran section of the Department of State's 2018 Report on International Religious Freedom provides, in part—

(1) "[N]on-Shia Muslims and those affiliated with a religion other than Islam, especially members of the Baha'i community, continued to face societal discrimination and harassment, and employers experienced social pressures not to hire Baha'is or to dismiss them from their private sector jobs"; and

(2) "The law bars Baha'is from founding their own educational institutions. A Ministry of Science, Research, and Technology order requires universities to exclude Baha'is from access to higher education or expel them if their religious affiliation becomes known";

Whereas on March 11, 2020, the Department of State released the 2019 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, which provides, in part—

(1) Iranian "[a]uthorities barred Baha'i students from higher education"; and

(2) "According to a Baha'i International Community report April 2018, Iranian authorities directed authorities in Houthi-controlled areas of Yemen to harass and detain Baha'is because of their religious affiliation";

Whereas the Baha'i International Community has documented more than 26,000 items of anti-Baha'i propaganda in Iran's official and semi-official media since January 2014.

Whereas since 2019, the Government of Iran has excluded Baha'is from receiving national identification cards, which are required for accessing basic everyday necessities, including obtaining a passport, making bank transactions, and getting work permits.

Whereas the Iranian Parliament (formally known as the "Islamic Consultative Assembly") is considering a bill to amend Articles 499 and 500 of Book 5 of the Islamic Penal Code of the Islamic Republic of Iran to criminalize all activities in support of any religious minority that is not recognized under Iran's constitution.

Whereas the Government of Iran is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, done at New York December 16, 1966, and is in violation of its obligations under such covenants;

Whereas section 105 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8514) authorizes the President to impose sanctions on individuals who are "responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009"; and

Whereas the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-158) amends and expands the authorities established under the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195) to sanction Iranian human rights abusers:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran —

(A) to immediately release the imprisoned or detained Baha'is and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(B) to end its state-sponsored campaign of hate propaganda against the Baha'is; and

(C) to reverse state-imposed policies denying equal opportunities to higher education, earning a livelihood, due process under the law, and the free exercise of religious practices;

(3) calls on the President and the Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations—

(A) to immediately condemn the Government of Iran's continued violation of human rights; and

(B) to demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and the Secretary of State to utilize available authorities to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Iranian Baha'i community.

SENATE RESOLUTION 579—ENCOURAGING THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY TO REMAIN COMMITTED TO COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION TO MITIGATE AND PREVENT THE FURTHER SPREAD OF COVID-19 AND URGING RENEWED UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION IN ANY GLOBAL EFFORTS ON THERAPEUTICS AND VACCINE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY TO ADDRESS COVID-19 AND PREVENT FURTHER DEATHS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CARPER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 579

Whereas there is a rich history of coordinated global health collaboration and coordination, dating back to 1851, to strategically and effectively combat deadly diseases of the time, such as the spread of plague;

Whereas the United States has long been an active and critical leader in such global public health efforts, providing financial and technical support to multilateral institutions, foreign governments, and nongovernmental organizations;

Whereas international collaboration has led to a number of historic global health achievements, including the eradication of smallpox, the reduction of polio cases by 99 percent, the elimination of river blindness, the decline in maternal and child mortality, the recognition of tobacco as a health hazard, and countless others;

Whereas there has been bipartisan support in the United States to lead efforts to address global health needs, as evidenced by initiatives such as the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and the President's Malaria Initiative;

Whereas, most recently, the United States led the global effort to stem the spread of Ebola, thereby avoiding a global pandemic and American deaths;

Whereas these bipartisan investments in global health have helped not only save countless lives around the world, but also at home in the United States;

Whereas an outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) was first identified in December 2019, with a global pandemic declaration by the World Health Organization on March 11, 2020;

Whereas at least 82,400 individuals in the United States are known to have died due to COVID-19 as of May 13, 2020, and a long-term, sustainable solution will require international access to a vaccine;

Whereas the COVID-19 outbreak continues to place extreme pressure on health care systems and supply chains worldwide, impacting international travel, trade, and all other

aspects of international exchanges, and requiring a coordinated global effort;

Whereas the interconnectivity of our globalized world means an infectious disease can travel around the world in as little as 36 hours;

Whereas United States Federal agencies have engaged in and supported certain research and clinical trial efforts into coronaviruses, which may yield potential discoveries related to vaccine candidates;

Whereas domestic and domestically supported vaccine candidates for COVID-19 only comprise a small fraction of the potential COVID-19 vaccine candidates undergoing studies worldwide;

Whereas only international collaboration and coordination can ensure equitable access to safe, effective, and affordable therapeutics and vaccines, thereby saving Americans and others around the world;

Whereas the United States has not yet joined "Solidarity", an international clinical trial to rapidly identify effective treatments for COVID-19;

Whereas the United States has not yet joined the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, an innovative global partnership which works to accelerate the development of vaccines against emerging infectious diseases and enable equitable access to these vaccines for people during outbreaks;

Whereas United States opposition to stronger international efforts to combat COVID-19 has created a rift within the Group of 20 and undermined such collective efforts and possible access for the United States to their successes;

Whereas, on April 24, 2020, the United States declined to participate in a virtual event led by a number of multilateral institutions, government leaders, and public health and industry leaders from around the world to accelerate new COVID-19 health technologies;

Whereas, on May 4, 2020, the United States declined to participate in a subsequent virtual summit led by the President of the European Commission, where nations around the world—excluding the United States—pledged more than \$8,000,000,000 to quickly develop vaccines and treatment to fight COVID-19; and

Whereas, on June 4, 2020, the United Kingdom will host another virtual international summit on accelerating the development of a vaccine for COVID-19, including to support GAVI, the Vaccine Alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historic leadership role of the United States in stemming global health crises in the past;

(2) commends the historic achievements of the international community in addressing global public health crises, such as the eradication of smallpox and dramatic progress in reducing cases of polio and Ebola;

(3) encourages the international community to remain committed to collaboration and coordination to mitigate and prevent the further spread of COVID-19;

(4) commends the promising research underway to develop COVID-19 therapies and a vaccine within the United States and with support from Federal agencies;

(5) acknowledges the vast international research enterprise and collaboration underway to study an expansive range of drug and vaccine candidates;

(6) urges renewed United States leadership and participation in any global efforts on therapeutics and vaccine development and delivery to address COVID-19 and prevent further American deaths; and

(7) calls on the United States Government to boost funding for, and strengthen collaboration with, key multilateral institutions at

the forefront of responding to COVID-19 such as the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations; GAVI, the Vaccine Alliance; and the Solidarity trial.

SENATE RESOLUTION 580—CONDEMNING ALL FORMS OF ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT AS RELATED TO COVID-19

Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 580

Whereas 23,000,000 Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders account for 7 percent of the population in the United States;

Whereas over 2,000,000 Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are working on the front lines of the COVID-19 pandemic in health care, law enforcement, first response, and transportation, as well as in service industries that involve keeping supermarkets operational;

Whereas the use of anti-Asian terminology and rhetoric related to COVID-19, such as the "Chinese Virus", "Wuhan Virus", and "Kung-flu", have perpetuated anti-Asian stigma;

Whereas, since January 2020, there has been a dramatic increase in reports of hate crimes and incidents against those of Asian descent;

Whereas, according to a recent study, there were over 400 cases of anti-Asian discrimination related to COVID-19 between February 9, 2020, and March 7, 2020;

Whereas the increased use of anti-Asian rhetoric has resulted in Asian Americans being harassed, assaulted, and scapegoated for the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas, in incidents of anti-Asian violence occurring in March 2020, a woman wearing a mask was kicked and punched at a New York City subway station, 2 children and 2 adults were stabbed at a wholesale grocery in Midland, Texas, a couple was assaulted and robbed by a group of attackers in Philadelphia, and a 16-year-old boy was sent to the hospital after being attacked by bullies in Los Angeles, California;

Whereas the increased use of anti-Asian rhetoric has also resulted in Asian American businesses being targeted for vandalism;

Whereas there are approximately 2,000,000 Asian American-owned businesses that generate over \$700,000,000,000 in annual revenue and employ millions of workers;

Whereas more than 1,900,000 Asian American and Pacific Islander older adults, particularly those older adults who are recent immigrants or have limited English proficiency, may face even greater challenges in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic, including discrimination, economic insecurity, and language isolation;

Whereas the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recognize that naming COVID-19 by its geographic location or linking COVID-19 to a specific ethnicity perpetuates stigma;

Whereas, in 2015, the WHO issued guidance calling on media outlets, scientists, and na-

tional authorities to avoid naming infectious diseases for locations to avoid stigmatizing groups of people;

Whereas, on February 27, 2020, the Secretary of Health and Human Services stated, "ethnicity is not what causes the novel coronavirus" and that it is inappropriate and inaccurate to call COVID-19 the "Chinese virus";

Whereas, on February 28, 2020, Dr. Mitch Wolfe, the Chief Medical Officer of the CDC, said, "stigma is the enemy of public health";

Whereas, on March 10, 2020, Dr. Robert Redfield, the Director of the CDC, testified that use of the term "Chinese coronavirus" is wrong and inappropriate; and

Whereas the Secretary-General of the United Nations called for international solidarity and an end to any ill-founded discrimination against the outbreak's victims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls on all public officials to condemn and denounce anti-Asian sentiment in any form;

(2) recognizes that the health and safety of all Americans, no matter their background, must be the utmost priority;

(3) condemns all manifestations or expressions of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, anti-Asian sentiment, scapegoating, and ethnic or religious intolerance;

(4) calls on Federal law enforcement officials, working with State and local officials—

(A) to expeditiously investigate and document all credible reports of hate crimes, incidents, and threats against the Asian American and Pacific Islander community in the United States;

(B) to collect data to document the rise of incidents of hate crimes relating to COVID-19; and

(C) to hold the perpetrators of those crimes, incidents, or threats accountable and bring such perpetrators to justice, including through investigation and prosecution; and

(5) recommit the United States to serving as a world leader in building more inclusive, diverse, and tolerant societies—

(A) by prioritizing language access and inclusivity in communication practices; and

(B) by combating misinformation and discrimination that put Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders at risk.

SENATE RESOLUTION 581—HONORING THE MEMORY OF JEREIMA "JERI" BUSTAMANTE ON THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF HER PASSING

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 581

Whereas Jereima "Jeri" Bustamante (referred to in this preamble as "Jeri Bustamante") lived the American Dream;

Whereas, after moving from Panama to the United States with her family, Jeri Bustamante—

(1) attended Miami Beach Senior High School; and

(2) earned a Bachelor's Degree in Communication and Media Sciences and a Master's Degree in Public Administration from Florida International University;

Whereas Jeri Bustamante had a tireless work ethic and a passion for communication, and paid for her education by working while enrolled in school;

Whereas that tireless work ethic propelled Jeri Bustamante to professional success, beginning with an internship at a Miami television station and culminating in a period of

service as press secretary to Governor Rick Scott;

Whereas the enthusiasm, compassion, tenacity, and vibrant energy of Jeri Bustamante are greatly missed by her family, friends, and coworkers;

Whereas the spirit of Jeri Bustamante lives on through the Jereima Bustamante Memorial Scholarship, which aims to help graduates of Miami Beach Senior High School achieve their goals and pursue the American Dream through a college education; and

Whereas April 8, 2020, marks 2 years since the life of Jeri Bustamante was tragically cut short in a fatal boating accident: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life and memory of Jereima “Jeri” Bustamante (referred to in this resolution as “Jeri Bustamante”);

(2) offers heartfelt condolences to the family, loved ones, and friends of Jeri Bustamante;

(3) recognizes that living the American Dream remains possible for any individual who, following the example of Jeri Bustamante, works hard to pursue and achieve a goal; and

(4) encourages the recipients of the Jereima Bustamante Memorial Scholarship to carry on the legacy of Jeri Bustamante.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1586. Mr. PAUL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 6172, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes.

SA 1587. Mr. CORNYN (for Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BOOKER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3607, to extend public safety officer death benefits to public safety officers whose death is caused by COVID-19, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1586. Mr. PAUL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 6172, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITIES IN FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE IX—LIMITATIONS

“SEC. 901. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITIES TO SURVEIL UNITED STATES PERSONS AND ON USE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING UNITED STATES PERSONS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE.—The terms ‘pen register’ and ‘trap and trace device’ have the meanings given such terms in section 3127 of title 18, United States Code.

“(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given such term in section 101.

“(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an officer of the United States may not under this Act request an order for, and the For-

eign Intelligence Surveillance Court may not under this Act order—

“(1) electronic surveillance of a United States person;

“(2) a physical search of a premises, information, material, or property used exclusively by, or under the open and exclusive control of, a United States person;

“(3) approval of the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device to obtain information concerning a United States person;

“(4) the production of tangible things (including books, records, papers, documents, and other items) concerning a United States person; or

“(5) the targeting of a United States person for the acquisition of information.

“(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING UNITED STATES PERSONS.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF AGGRIEVED PERSON.—In this subsection, the term ‘aggrieved person’ means a person who is the target of any surveillance activity under this Act or any other person whose communications or activities were subject to any surveillance activity under this Act.

“(2) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), any information concerning a United States person acquired under this Act shall not be used in evidence against that United States person in any criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of any criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

“(3) USE BY AGGRIEVED PERSONS.—An aggrieved person who is a United States person may use information concerning such person acquired under this Act in a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of a criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

“(d) WARRANTS.—An officer of the United States seeking to conduct electronic surveillance, a physical search, installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device, production of tangible things, or targeting for acquisition of information with respect to a United States person as described in subsection (b) may only conduct such activities pursuant to a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure by a Federal court other than the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents preceding section 101 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE IX—LIMITATIONS

“Sec. 901. Limitations on authorities to surveil United States persons and on use of information concerning United States persons.”.

(b) LIMITATION ON SURVEILLANCE UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 12333.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) AGGRIEVED PERSON.—The term “aggrieved person” means a person who is the target of any surveillance activity under Executive Order 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note; relating to United States intelligence activities) or any other person whose communications or activities were subject to any surveillance activity under such Executive Order.

(B) PEN REGISTER; TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE; UNITED STATES PERSON.—The terms “pen register”, “trap and trace device”, and “United States person” have the meanings given such terms in section 901 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (a).

(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), any information concerning a United States person acquired under Executive Order 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note; relating to United States intelligence activities)

shall not be used in evidence against that United States person in any criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of any criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

(3) USE BY AGGRIEVED PERSONS.—An aggrieved person who is a United States person may use information concerning such person acquired under Executive Order 12333 in a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of a criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

SA 1587. Mr. CORNYN (for Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BOOKER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3607, to extend public safety officer death benefits to public safety officers whose death is caused by COVID-19, and for other purposes; as follows:

In section 2(a)(5), strike “deaths resulting from infectious disease sustained by public safety officers in carrying out their duties, the determination of claims may” and insert “deaths and permanent and total disabilities resulting from infectious disease sustained by public safety officers in carrying out their duties, the determination of claims involving personal injuries believed to have resulted from COVID-19 or its complications may”.

In section 3, strike “As determined” and insert “(a) DEATH BENEFITS.—As determined”.

At the end of section 3, add the following:

(b) DISABILITY BENEFITS.—As determined by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, COVID-19 (or complications therefrom) suffered by a public safety officer shall be presumed to constitute a personal injury within the meaning of section 1201(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10281(b)), sustained in the line of duty by the officer, if—

(1) the officer engaged in a line of duty action or activity between January 1, 2020, and December 31, 2021; and

(2) the officer was diagnosed with COVID-19 (or evidence indicates that the officer had COVID-19) during the 45-day period beginning on the last day of duty of the officer.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a request for one committee to meet during today’s session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 14, 2020, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

CONDEMNING GROSS HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS OF ETHNIC TURKIC MUSLIMS IN XINJIANG

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3744, introduced earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3744) to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

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

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

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

The bill (S. 3744) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3744

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Statement of purpose.
- Sec. 3. Findings.
- Sec. 4. Sense of Congress.
- Sec. 5. Updating statement of United States policy toward the People’s Republic of China.
- Sec. 6. Imposition of sanctions.
- Sec. 7. Report on human rights abuses in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.
- Sec. 8. Report on protecting citizens and residents of the United States from intimidation and coercion.
- Sec. 9. Report on security and economic implications of repression in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region by the Government of the People’s Republic of China.
- Sec. 10. Classified report.

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to direct United States resources to address human rights violations and abuses, including gross violations of human rights, by the Government of the People’s Republic of China through the mass surveillance and internment of over 1,000,000 Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of the People’s Republic of China has a long history of repressing Turkic Muslims and other Muslim minority groups, particularly Uyghurs, in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. In recent decades, central and regional Chinese government policies have systematically discriminated against these minority groups by denying them a range of civil and political rights, including the freedom of expression, religion, and movement, and the right to a fair trial.

(2) In May 2014, the Government of the People’s Republic of China launched its latest “Strike Hard Against Violent Extremism” campaign, using wide-scale, internationally-linked threats of terrorism as a pretext to justify pervasive restrictions on and serious human rights violations of members of ethnic minority communities in

Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. The August 2016 appointment of former Tibet Autonomous Region Party Secretary Chen Quanguo to be Party Secretary of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region accelerated the crackdown across the region. Scholars, human rights organizations, journalists, and think tanks have provided ample evidence substantiating the establishment by the Government of the People’s Republic of China of internment camps. Since 2014, the Government of the People’s Republic of China has detained more than 1,000,000 Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in these camps. The total ethnic minority population of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region was approximately 13,000,000 at the time of the last census conducted by the People’s Republic of China in 2010.

(3) The Government of the People’s Republic of China’s actions against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region violate international human rights laws and norms, including—

(A) the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, to which the People’s Republic of China has acceded;

(B) the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which the People’s Republic of China has signed and ratified;

(C) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the People’s Republic of China has signed; and

(D) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(4) Senior Chinese Communist Party officials, including current Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region Party Secretary Chen Quanguo, who executes Chinese government policy in the region, and former Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region Deputy Party Secretary Zhu Hailun, who crafted many of the policies implemented in the region, bear direct responsibility for gross human rights violations committed against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups. These abuses include the arbitrary detention of more than 1,000,000 Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups, separation of working age adults from children and the elderly, and the integration of forced labor into supply chains.

(5) Those detained in internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region have described forced political indoctrination, torture, beatings, food deprivation, and denial of religious, cultural, and linguistic freedoms. These victims have confirmed that they were told by guards that the only way to secure their release was to demonstrate sufficient political loyalty. Poor conditions and lack of medical treatment at such facilities appear to have contributed to the deaths of some detainees, including the elderly and infirm.

(6) Uyghurs and ethnic Kazakhs who have obtained permanent residence or citizenship in other countries report being subjected to threats and harassment from Chinese officials. At least 5 journalists for Radio Free Asia’s Uyghur service have publicly detailed abuses their family members in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region have endured in response to their work exposing the Government of the People’s Republic of China’s abusive policies.

(7) In September 2018, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Michelle Bachelet noted in her first speech as High Commissioner the “deeply disturbing allegations of large-scale arbitrary detentions of Uyghurs and other Muslim communities, in

so-called reeducation camps across Xinjiang”.

(8) In 2019, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China concluded that, based on available evidence, the establishment and actions committed in the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region may constitute “crimes against humanity”.

(9) On December 31, 2018, President Donald J. Trump signed into law the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–409), which—

(A) condemns the People’s Republic of China’s “forced disappearances, extralegal detentions, invasive and omnipresent surveillance, and lack of due process in judicial proceedings”;

(B) authorizes funding to promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in the People’s Republic of China; and

(C) supports sanctions designations against any entity or individual that—

(i) violates human rights or religious freedoms; or

(ii) engages in censorship activities.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should—

(A) condemn abuses against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, members of other Muslim minority groups, and other persons by authorities of the People’s Republic of China; and

(B) call on such authorities to immediately—

(i) close the internment camps;

(ii) lift all restrictions on, and ensure respect for, human rights; and

(iii) allow people inside the People’s Republic of China to reestablish contact with their loved ones, friends, and associates outside the People’s Republic of China;

(2) the Secretary of State should consider strategically employing sanctions and other tools under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401 et seq.), including measures resulting from the designation of the People’s Republic of China as a country of particular concern for religious freedom under section 402(b)(1)(A)(ii) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)(1)(A)(ii)), that directly address particularly severe violations of religious freedom;

(3) the Secretary of State should—

(A) work with United States allies and partners and through multilateral institutions to condemn the mass arbitrary detention of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) coordinate closely with the international community on targeted sanctions and visa restrictions;

(4) the journalists of the Uyghur language service of Radio Free Asia should be commended for their reporting on the human rights and political situation in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region despite efforts by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to silence or intimidate their reporting through the detention of family members and relatives in China;

(5) the United States should expand the availability of and capacity for Uyghur language programming on Radio Free Asia in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(6) the Federal Bureau of Investigation and appropriate United States law enforcement agencies should take steps to hold accountable officials from the People’s Republic of China or individuals acting on their behalf who harass, threaten, or intimidate persons within the United States; and

(7) United States companies and individuals selling goods or services or otherwise operating in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous

Region should take steps, including in any public or financial filings, to ensure that—

(A) their commercial activities are not contributing to human rights violations in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region or elsewhere in China; and

(B) their supply chains are not compromised by forced labor.

SEC. 5. UPDATING STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

Section 901(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246; 104 Stat. 84) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (8), (9), and (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) United States policy toward the People's Republic of China should be explicitly linked to the situation in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, specifically as to whether—

“(A) the internment of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in internment camps has ended;

“(B) all political prisoners are released;

“(C) the use of mass surveillance and predictive policing to discriminate against and violate the human rights of members of specific ethnic groups has ceased and is not evident in other parts of China; and

“(D) the Government of the People's Republic of China has ended particularly severe restrictions of religious and cultural practice in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.”.

SEC. 6. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the President shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that identifies each foreign person, including any official of the Government of the People's Republic of China, that the President determines is responsible for any of the following with respect to Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, members of other Muslim minority groups, or other persons in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region:

(A) Torture.

(B) Cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

(C) Prolonged detention without charges and trial.

(D) Causing the disappearance of persons by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons.

(E) Other flagrant denial of the right to life, liberty, or the security of persons.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to each foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1).

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and in-

terests in property of a foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if such property and interests in property—

(A) are in the United States;

(B) come within the United States; or

(C) come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is subject to revocation of any visa or other entry documentation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect immediately; and

(II) cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a foreign person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if the President determines and certifies to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

(f) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under this section shall not apply to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under subsection (c)(2) shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary—

(A) to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations; or

(B) to carry out or assist law enforcement activity in the United States.

(3) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this section shall not include the au-

thority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) GOOD DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “good” means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(g) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines and reports to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives not later than 15 days before the termination takes effect that—

(1) information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(3) the person has credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior, has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed, and has credibly committed to not engage in an activity described in subsection (a)(1) in the future; or

(4) the termination of the sanctions is in the national security interests of the United States.

(h) SUNSET.—This section, and any sanctions imposed under this section, shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admission”, “admitted”, and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(3) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies and civil society organizations, shall—

(1) submit a report on human rights abuses in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) make the report described in paragraph (1) available on the website of the Department of State.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the number of individuals detained in internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(2) a description of the conditions in such camps for detainees, including, to the extent practicable, an assessment of—

(A) methods of torture;

(B) efforts to force individuals to renounce their faith; and

(C) other serious human rights abuses;

(3) to the extent practicable, an assessment of the number of individuals in the region in forced labor camps;

(4) a description of the methods used by People's Republic of China authorities to "reeducate" detainees in internment camps, including a list of government agencies of the People's Republic of China in charge of such reeducation;

(5) an assessment of the use and nature of forced labor in and related to the detention of Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, including a description of foreign companies and industries directly benefitting from such labor;

(6) an assessment of the level of access to Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region granted by the Government of the People's Republic of China to foreign diplomats and consular agents, independent journalists, and representatives of nongovernmental organizations;

(7) an assessment of the mass surveillance, predictive policing, and other methods used by the Government of the People's Republic of China to violate the human rights of persons in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(8) a description of the frequency with which foreign governments are forcibly returning Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and other refugees and asylum seekers to the People's Republic of China;

(9) a description, as appropriate, of United States diplomatic efforts with allies and other nations—

(A) to address the gross violations of human rights in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) to protect asylum seekers from the region; and

(10) the identification of the offices within the Department of State that are responsible for leading and coordinating the diplomatic efforts referred to in paragraph (9).

SEC. 8. REPORT ON PROTECTING CITIZENS AND RESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM INTIMIDATION AND COERCION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that outlines all of the efforts to protect United States citizens and residents, including ethnic Uyghurs and Chinese nationals legally studying or working temporarily in the United States, who have experienced harassment or intimidation within the United States by officials or agents of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 9. REPORT ON SECURITY AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF REPRESSION IN XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives on the matters described in subsection (b).

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the national and regional security threats posed to the United States by the policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(2) a description of—

(A) the acquisition or development of technology by the Government of the People's Republic of China to facilitate internment and mass surveillance in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, including technology related to predictive policing and large-scale data collection and analysis; and

(B) the threats that the acquisition, development, and use of such technologies pose to the United States;

(3) a list of Chinese companies that are involved in—

(A) constructing or operating the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; or

(B) providing or operating mass surveillance technology in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(4) a description of the role of the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps in internment and forced labor in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 10. CLASSIFIED REPORT.

The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with such elements of the Intelligence Community as the Director deems appropriate, shall submit a classified report to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that assesses the ability of the United States Government to collect and analyze intelligence regarding—

(1) the scope and scale of the detention and forced labor of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in the People's Republic of China;

(2) the gross violations of human rights perpetrated inside the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(3) other policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region that constitute gross violations of human rights.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, since the Senate returned to Washington 2 weeks ago after about a 6-week hiatus, we have accomplished quite a bit on a bipartisan basis. We have confirmed national security nominees; we have held hearings to examine liability limitations, coronavirus testing, safely getting back to work and school, and the impact of the pandemic on broadband. In short, the Senate has been working, on a bipartisan basis, to understand the challenges that this virus has created so we can provide targeted reforms.

It certainly seems to be a different approach than the one taken by the House. Earlier this week, House Democrats released a so-called coronavirus relief bill. You might say they kind of mailed it in because they haven't been here for the last 2 weeks, but it has an absolutely staggering pricetag—\$3 trillion, with a "t." That is more than we spent in the first four coronavirus response bills combined.

I tell my constituents, when I am talking to them on a videoconference call or teleconference, that 2 months ago, I never would have imagined that the Senate would be voting on trillion-dollar bills, but now apparently the House wants to make this a routine way to do business and particularly without much debate.

As astounding as that figure is, the biggest issue with that bill isn't the cost or the fact that Speaker PELOSI and her party drafted it in secret but that they released the 1,800-page bill text on Tuesday, and they plan to vote on it tomorrow. Unbelievable.

It would be an understatement to say there are concerns with this kind of legislating. I would call it legislative malpractice, to be kind. It is not just from Republicans or the administration or the American people; the Speaker's own Members are begging for additional time to review this massive bill. Unlike the previous coronavirus response bills passed here in Congress, there have been no bipartisan discussions in the production of that bill from the House—not with House Republicans, not with the administration, and certainly not with us. I can assure you that this legislation looks just like the kind of product that you would expect from that type of flawed process. It is partisan; it is unaffordable; it is unrealistic; and it stands absolutely no chance of becoming law.

We all know that legislation drafted in a vacuum by one political party in one Chamber isn't a good-faith effort to try to survive, much less address, this pandemic crisis. It is a political statement as much as anything else, a liberal wish list which, if passed—which it will not be—would sink us further in debt without the benefit of addressing the problems we are actually facing.

When this legislation was announced, Speaker PELOSI said:

We all know we must put more money in the pockets of the American people. This is not only necessary for their survival, but it is also a stimulus to the economy.

But the ones set to reap the biggest benefits from this bill aren't the ones struggling to make ends meet. Actually, what Speaker PELOSI is apparently trying to do is help some of the wealthiest people in America.

This legislation would reinstate the so-called SALT deduction—the State and local tax deduction—and thrust that burden of subsidizing the wealthiest people in the bluest parts of the country on the rest of us. We were able to cap that in a fair and realistic way in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Prior to that tax reform, taxpayers who itemized their returns could deduct the amount of State and local taxes they paid with no limit. So, if you lived in a high-tax State like New York, there was no limit to your ability to deduct those State and local taxes. You know who paid for it? The people of Indiana, the people of Alaska, the people of Texas, and the people of other States who more responsibly dealt with their fiscal affairs.

Now, for the average American, this change hasn't even been a blip on the radar screen. For the millionaires and billionaires, though, the ones Speaker PELOSI's bill would benefit most directly, this was a huge blow.

People say, well, the wealthy ought to pay more. Well, OK. Here is a way for them to do it in the right way, but it is also a way to hold your State and local jurisdictions accountable for the high taxes they pass, only to previously allow those taxes to be deducted from the Federal income tax, so this is a matter of political accountability for them, too.

I am sure the wealthiest Americans were delighted to see that the Democrats' response to what Speaker PELOSI called the biggest catastrophe in our Nation's history would allow them, once again, to reap the benefits of this no-limit deduction. If the SALT cap were removed, they would receive an average tax cut of nearly \$60,000. That is higher than the household income for many Texans and many Americans. To make matters worse, this would sink our country further in debt.

The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Tax estimates that doing away with the SALT cap would cost about \$700 billion over the next 7 years, with almost 95 percent of the benefit going to those making at least \$200,000 and more than half going to those making more than \$1 million a year.

Now, we have spent a lot of money in the last couple of months, but we have done so in the face of an emergency—kind of like the civilian equivalent of World War II—fighting this virus, both the public health and the economic consequences, so we are already looking at staggering debt that we are going to have to deal with at some point because it is immoral to expect our kids and grandkids to pay that money back after we have already cashed those checks.

But this just adds insult to injury, what Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats are trying to do. Even the liberal Tax Policy Center reported that one-third of the SALT deduction went to the top 1 percent. We hear our Democrat friends talk about income inequality and the top 1 percent needing to pay more. Well, then, their actions are directly contrary to their rhetoric. We know 80 percent of the benefit went to the top 20 percent income earners.

Now, we are not trying to start a civil war here between people who are doing well and people who are not doing well, but this just makes abso-

lutely no sense, particularly in the face of a crisis like the coronavirus. This isn't an attempt to support those who are struggling to make ends meet. That is who we ought to be focusing on: the people who are not getting a paycheck because their business has been shut down, their restaurant, their bar, their sports stadium. This is a get-out-of-jail-free card for millionaires and billionaires who don't want to pay their fair share of taxes and would foist that unfairly onto others.

Now, I realize that is only a small portion of the bill. After all, it is a \$3 trillion bill. So let's dive into a couple of other things—changes, for example, they would make in unemployment insurance. The CARES Act we passed—I think it was March 25—expanded unemployment benefits to include workers who would not typically be eligible for those benefits, the self-employed and independent contractors. It also provided an additional \$600 of Federal benefit on top of the State's unemployment benefit through the end of July, for 4 months.

The theory behind that was to provide workers who lost their jobs with the money they needed to pay for the necessities of life until the economy could reopen and they could go back to work.

Slowly but surely, businesses across this country are starting to reopen their doors—safely and gradually reopen their doors—and many are facing an unlikely burden, which is now getting people to come back to work. Over the last several weeks, I have heard Texas businesses struggling to rehire their employees because they are making more from unemployment than they would if they worked.

And it is not an isolated issue. According to the Texas Workforce Commission that administers our unemployment insurance program, 80 percent of the people are making more money on unemployment than they were when previously employed—80 percent.

Now, that clearly was a mistake in the underlying bill. It is true that, when you do something that big and that fast, you are going to make some mistakes, but nobody can think this is sound public policy: to pay people more for not working than when they do work.

Here is what House Democrats do. They extend that mistake through next January, providing even less of an incentive for workers to find new jobs. The United States can't be the successful economy that we are capable of being or have been by encouraging people not to work. At a certain point, these benefits are going to do more harm than good, and I would say they are already starting to do that. So, extending unemployment benefits to next year would deter people from trying to return to work because, why would they? Why would someone choose to do more work for less money?

Well, I understand the need to support the American people until they

are able to get back on their feet, but I am afraid this move would stunt—would retard—any hope of economic recovery, and it would deepen the hiring struggle businesses are already facing—and I am glad that they are hiring—and ensure that the “Sorry, we're closed” sign remains on the door of Main Street businesses throughout the country.

As we begin to recover from the economic crisis that this virus has caused, our country will need a lot more from Congress than a blank check written in a back room. Rushing to appear to do something while doing absolutely nothing, which is what House Democrats have done, will not do any good unless we are taking the time to find out what America's healthcare professionals, small businesses, and workers actually need.

That is what we are doing every day: listening. How is what we have already done working? What are the mistakes that need to be corrected? Where are the gaps that need to be filled—at a time when about a half-trillion dollars of that money from the CARES Act isn't even out the door yet from the Main Street lending facility that is being set up through the Federal Reserve.

I am not blaming Treasury. I am just saying, they are covered up, and they are working 24/7, but let's see how what we have already done works before we continue to shovel more money aimlessly out the door.

Earlier this week, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing to examine liability around the coronavirus pandemic. One of our witnesses was Kevin Smartt, a Texan from Bonham, TX—the home of Sam Rayburn—who is CEO and President of Kwik Chek food stores. I think he has 47 fast-food stores. In his opening statement, he outlined the steps that Kwik Chek took to protect the safety of its employees and customers while continuing to provide access to essential items like food and fuel.

They followed the constantly shifting guidelines from the CDC and other Federal, State, and local government agencies and adjusted and adapted accordingly. Like millions of businesses across the country, Kwik Chek implemented strict cleaning protocols. They installed sneeze guards in their stores, they put markers on the floor to help customers maintain social distancing, and they made every effort to obtain masks and hand sanitizer, but have often struggled to overcome supply disruptions.

In his testimony, Kevin said:

Unfortunately, despite trying to do everything we can to protect the health and safety of our customers and employees during this pandemic, my companies now have targets on our back because our doors have remained open. That's just not right. We are all in this together, and my businesses shouldn't become targets for liability threats just because they serve their communities.

I found this is a common fear for businesses small and large alike, as

well as for our dedicated healthcare professionals. Can you imagine serving on the frontline of this fight against the pandemic, doing everything you can possibly do to help people who are sick and injured, and, despite acting in good faith to protect employees, customers, or patients, we know that a certain element of the bar are lining up to file opportunistic lawsuits against these hard-working men and women, people who I think we all consider to be heroes.

Across the country, lawsuits have already begun rolling in by the hundreds. Unless we take action, we are going to wake up from this pandemic only to find ourselves in a legal nightmare.

Now, I want to be clear. Bad actors don't deserve blanket immunity. We are all in agreement on that point, but hard-working Americans who are trying to do the best thing and follow, in good faith, the guidance that their government gives them deserve a safe harbor from frivolous litigation and nuisance lawsuits. This Chamber is full of lawyers—Democrat lawyers, Republican lawyers—who are well aware of just how damaging this unlimited litigation that will ensue will be on our economic recovery.

While House Democrats have been crafting their dead-on-arrival liberal wish list, we have been working on legislation which can and should gain bipartisan support and protect our frontline workers in the process.

We are working on legislation to provide liability protections for the men and women who have supported us through this crisis and who will be the key to our recovery from this crisis. We simply must protect those who have acted in good faith from having to defend costly legal battles—only to win—only to lose their business because they can't survive that additional burden—going through the pandemic, the shutdown, only to find, just when you think you are coming out of it, that you are being drowned with litigation costs.

I believe we should continue to provide an opportunity to seek legal recourse for those who act willfully or exercise reckless disregard for the health and safety of others. Those are the kinds of cases that deserve, in my opinion, access to compensation.

Make no mistake, our country's road to recovery isn't going to be easy, and we have already caught a glimpse of the next epidemic, the lawsuit epidemic, that is waiting around the corner.

Unlike House Democrats, who are moving full-speed ahead, the Senate has chosen to tap the brakes and figure out the best way to avoid hitting the brakes, economically and from a public health perspective.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate to

proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 583 and 633 through 639 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, all en bloc, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows

IN THE ARMY

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Aaron R. Dean, II

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael W. Bank
Col. Monica M. Brouse
Col. Allan R. Cecil
Col. Michael A. Comstock
Col. Kevin V. Doyle
Col. Akshai M. Gandhi
Col. Thomas C. Hannon
Col. Thomas J. James
Col. David W. Manson
Col. John J. Ptak, Jr.
Col. Michael D. Stohler
Col. Edwin A. VanDerWolde
Col. Mark A. Vavra

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Gary M. Brito

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Carl P. Chebi
Rear Adm. (lh) David A. Goggins
Rear Adm. (lh) Douglas W. Small

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Rick Freedman

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Susan Bryerjoyner
Capt. John A. Watkins

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Mark A. Melson
Capt. Michael S. Sciretta

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade

indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Eugene H. Black, III

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE ARMY

PN1463 ARMY nominations (965) beginning WILLIAM P. ABBOTT, and ending D015041, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1464 ARMY nominations (628) beginning DAVIS M. ABT, and ending D014989, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1465 ARMY nominations (628) beginning JAMIE E. ABEL, and ending D014063, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1466 ARMY nominations (40) beginning ADESOLA O. ADEPEGBA, and ending G010437, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1522 ARMY nomination of Jamal D. Snell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2020.

PN1640 ARMY nomination of Kelly L. French, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 2, 2020.

PN1696 ARMY nomination of William A. Forbes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN1366 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning JEFFREY T. JONES, II, and ending JUAN F. RODRIGUEZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1487 MARINE CORPS nominations (6) beginning MATTHEW S. BREEN, and ending REYES J. RIVAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1488-1 MARINE CORPS nominations (395) beginning BRETT D. ABBAMONTE, and ending JASON C. YURISIC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1658-1 MARINE CORPS nominations (106) beginning JOSHUA D. ANDERSON, and ending SCOTT W. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 2, 2020.

IN THE NAVY

PN1482 NAVY nomination of Daniel M. Wiegrefe, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1570 NAVY nomination of Katherine L. Jaudon, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 13, 2020.

PN1654 NAVY nomination of Paul D. Sargent, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 2, 2020.

PN1657 NAVY nomination of Christopher C. Supko, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 2, 2020.

PN1697 NAVY nomination of James G. Buckley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.

PN1698 NAVY nomination of Michael G. Matson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.

PN1699 NAVY nomination of Kevan M. Mellendick, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.

PN1700 NAVY nomination of Andrew S. Morris, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.

PN1701 NAVY nomination of Andrew D. Cordrey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.

PN1702 NAVY nomination of Nicholas R. Leinweber, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.

PN1703 NAVY nomination of Sean A. McKay, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 16, 2020.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

SAFEGUARDING AMERICA'S FIRST RESPONDERS ACT OF 2020

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3607.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3607) to extend public safety officer death benefits to public safety officers whose death is caused by COVID-19, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley-Booker amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1587) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

In section 2(a)(5), strike “deaths resulting from infectious disease sustained by public safety officers in carrying out their duties, the determination of claims may” and insert “deaths and permanent and total disabilities resulting from infectious disease sustained by public safety officers in carrying out their duties, the determination of claims involving personal injuries believed to have resulted from COVID-19 or its complications may”.

In section 3, strike “As determined” and insert “(a) DEATH BENEFITS.—As determined”.

At the end of section 3, add the following:

(b) DISABILITY BENEFITS.—As determined by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, COVID-19 (or complications therefrom) suffered by a public safety officer shall be presumed to constitute a personal injury within the meaning of section 1201(b) of title I of the

Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10281(b)), sustained in the line of duty by the officer, if—

(1) the officer engaged in a line of duty action or activity between January 1, 2020, and December 31, 2021; and

(2) the officer was diagnosed with COVID-19 (or evidence indicates that the officer had COVID-19) during the 45-day period beginning on the last day of duty of the officer.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 3607), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 3607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Safeguarding America’s First Responders Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS; PURPOSE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) an infectious disease pandemic known as COVID-19 exists;

(2) to date, there is much still unknown about COVID-19, but it is known that COVID-19 and related complications may be fatal;

(3) services provided by public safety officers are nonetheless essential during this pandemic;

(4) due to the COVID-19 pandemic and what is currently known about how the disease is spread, public safety officers are uncharacteristically at risk of contracting the disease; and

(5) although the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits program currently covers deaths and permanent and total disabilities resulting from infectious disease sustained by public safety officers in carrying out their duties, the determination of claims involving personal injuries believed to have resulted from COVID-19 or its complications may be uniquely challenging or delayed given the lack of—

(A) definitive testing and medical records at this time; and

(B) a definitive uniform body of medical information about how the disease is spread or its effects.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to establish a carefully drawn framework wherein claims under the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits program, arising under the unique circumstances described in subsection (a), can be processed expeditiously and under fair and clear standards.

SEC. 3. PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER BENEFITS.

(a) DEATH BENEFITS.—As determined by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, unless competent medical evidence establishes that the death of a public safety officer (as defined in section 1204 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10284)) was directly and proximately caused by something other than COVID-19, COVID-19 (or complications therefrom) suffered by the public safety officer shall be presumed to constitute a personal injury within the meaning of section 1201(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10281(a)), sustained in the line of duty by the officer and directly and proximately resulting in death, if—

(1) the officer engaged in a line of duty action or activity between January 1, 2020, and December 31, 2021;

(2) the officer was diagnosed with COVID-19 (or evidence indicates that the officer had COVID-19) during the 45-day period beginning on the last day of duty of the officer; and

(3) evidence indicates that the officer had COVID-19 (or complications therefrom) at the time of the officer’s death.

(b) DISABILITY BENEFITS.—As determined by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, COVID-19 (or complications therefrom) suffered by a public safety officer shall be presumed to constitute a personal injury within the meaning of section 1201(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10281(b)), sustained in the line of duty by the officer, if—

(1) the officer engaged in a line of duty action or activity between January 1, 2020, and December 31, 2021; and

(2) the officer was diagnosed with COVID-19 (or evidence indicates that the officer had COVID-19) during the 45-day period beginning on the last day of duty of the officer.

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

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

CONFIDENTIALITY OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEER SUPPORT COUNSELING ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 3434 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3434) to make Federal law enforcement officer peer support communications confidential, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CORNYN. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 3434) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3434

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Confidentiality Opportunities for Peer Support Counseling Act” or the “COPS Counseling Act”.

SEC. 2. CONFIDENTIALITY OF PEER SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term “law enforcement agency” means a Federal agency that employs a law enforcement officer.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term “law enforcement officer” has the meaning

given the term “Federal law enforcement officer” in section 115 of title 18, United States Code.

(3) **PEER SUPPORT COMMUNICATION.**—The term “peer support communication” includes—

(A) an oral or written communication made in the course of a peer support counseling session;

(B) a note or report arising out of a peer support counseling session;

(C) a record of a peer support counseling session; or

(D) with respect to a communication made by a peer support participant in the course of a peer support counseling session, another communication, regarding the first communication, that is made between a peer support specialist and—

(i) another peer support specialist;

(ii) a staff member of a peer support counseling program; or

(iii) a supervisor of the peer support specialist.

(4) **PEER SUPPORT COUNSELING PROGRAM.**—The term “peer support counseling program” means a program provided by a law enforcement agency that provides counseling services from a peer support specialist to a law enforcement officer of the agency.

(5) **PEER SUPPORT COUNSELING SESSION.**—The term “peer support counseling session” means any counseling formally provided through a peer support counseling program between a peer support specialist and one or more law enforcement officers.

(6) **PEER SUPPORT PARTICIPANT.**—The term “peer support participant” means a law enforcement officer who receives counseling services from a peer support specialist.

(7) **PEER SUPPORT SPECIALIST.**—The term “peer support specialist” means a law enforcement officer who—

(A) has received training in—

(i) peer support counseling; and

(ii) providing emotional and moral support to law enforcement officers who have been involved in or exposed to an emotionally traumatic experience in the course of employment; and

(B) is designated by a law enforcement agency to provide the services described in subparagraph (A).

(b) **PROHIBITION.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), a peer support specialist or a peer support participant may not disclose the contents of a peer support communication to an individual who was not a party to the peer support communication.

(c) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Subsection (b) shall not apply to a peer support communication if—

(1) the peer support communication contains—

(A) an explicit threat of suicide;

(B) an explicit threat of imminent and serious physical bodily harm or death to a clearly identified or identifiable individual;

(C) information—

(i) relating to the abuse or neglect of—

(I) a child; or

(II) an older or vulnerable individual; or

(ii) that is required by law to be reported;

or

(D) an admission of criminal conduct;

(2) the disclosure is permitted by each peer support participant who was a party to, as applicable—

(A) the peer support communication;

(B) the peer support counseling session out of which the peer support communication arose;

(C) the peer support counseling session of which the peer support communication is a record; or

(D) the communication made in the course of a peer support counseling session that the peer support communication is regarding; or

(3) a court of competent jurisdiction issues an order or subpoena requiring the disclosure of the peer support communication.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed to prohibit the disclosure of—

(1) an observation made by a law enforcement officer of a peer support participant outside of a peer support counseling session; or

(2) knowledge of a law enforcement officer about a peer support participant not gained from a peer support communication.

(e) **DISCLOSURE OF RIGHTS.**—Before the initial peer support counseling session of a peer support participant, a peer support specialist shall inform the peer support participant in writing of the confidentiality requirement under subsection (b) and the exceptions to the requirement under subsection (c).

SEC. 3. BEST PRACTICES AND SUPPORT.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FIRST RESPONDER.**—The term “first responder” has the meaning given the term “public safety officer” in section 1204 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10284).

(2) **FIRST RESPONDER AGENCY.**—The term “first responder agency” means a Federal, State, local, or Tribal agency that employs or otherwise engages the services of a first responder.

(3) **PEER SUPPORT COUNSELING PROGRAM.**—The term “peer support counseling program” means a program provided by a first responder agency that provides counseling services from a peer support specialist to a first responder of the first responder agency.

(4) **PEER SUPPORT PARTICIPANT.**—The term “peer support participant” means a first responder who receives counseling services from a peer support specialist.

(5) **PEER SUPPORT SPECIALIST.**—The term “peer support specialist” means a first responder who—

(A) has received training in—

(i) peer support counseling; and

(ii) providing emotional and moral support to first responders who have been involved in or exposed to an emotionally traumatic experience in the course of the duties of the first responder; and

(B) is designated by a first responder agency to provide the services described in subparagraph (A).

(b) **REPORT ON BEST PRACTICES.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall develop a report on best practices and professional standards for peer support counseling programs for first responder agencies that includes—

(1) advice on—

(A) establishing and operating peer support counseling programs; and

(B) training and certifying peer support specialists;

(2) a code of ethics for peer support specialists;

(3) recommendations for continuing education for peer support specialists;

(4) advice on disclosing to first responders any confidentiality rights of peer support participants; and

(5) information on—

(A) the different types of peer support counseling programs in use by first responder agencies;

(B) any differences in peer support counseling programs offered across categories of first responders; and

(C) the important role senior first responders play in supporting access to mental health resources.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Attorney General shall support and encourage the imple-

mentation of peer support counseling programs in first responder agencies by—

(1) making the report developed under subsection (b) publicly available on the website of the Department of Justice; and

(2) providing a list of peer support specialist training programs on the website of the Department of Justice.

LAW ENFORCEMENT SUICIDE DATA COLLECTION ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2746 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2746) to require the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide information on suicide rates in law enforcement, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CORNYN. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 2746) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2746

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act”.

SEC. 2. INFORMATION ON SUICIDE IN LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish, for the purpose of preventing future law enforcement suicides and promoting understanding of suicide in law enforcement, the Law Enforcement Officers Suicide Data Collection Program, under which law enforcement agencies may submit to the Director information on suicides and attempted suicides within such law enforcement agencies, including information on—

(1) the circumstances and events that occurred before each suicide or attempted suicide;

(2) the general location of each suicide or attempted suicide;

(3) the demographic information of each law enforcement officer who commits or attempts suicide;

(4) the occupational category, including criminal investigator, corrections officer, line of duty officer, 911 dispatch operator, of each law enforcement officer who commits or attempts suicide; and

(5) the method used in each suicide or attempted suicide.

(b) **POLICIES.**—The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall work with the Confidentiality and Data Access Committee of the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology to develop publication policies to manage the risk of identity disclosure based upon the

best practices identified by other Federal statistical programs.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to Congress and publish on the website of the Federal Bureau of Investigation a report containing the information submitted to the Director pursuant to subsection (a).

(d) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—The report described under subsection (c) may not include any personally identifiable information of a law enforcement officer who commits or attempts suicide.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “law enforcement agency” means a Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency engaged in the prevention, detection, or investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of any violation of the criminal laws of the United States, a State, Tribal, or a political subdivision of a State;

(2) the term “law enforcement officer” means any current or former officer (including a correctional officer), agent, or employee of the United States, a State, Indian Tribe, or a political subdivision of a State authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of the criminal laws of the United States, a State, Indian Tribe, or a political subdivision of a State; and

(3) the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING THE ADVOCATES, COUNSELORS, VOLUNTEERS, AND FIRST RESPONDERS WHO SERVED SURVIVORS ON AN EMERGENCY BASIS DURING NATIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 555.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 555) recognizing and supporting the advocates, counselors, volunteers, and first responders who served survivors on an emergency basis during National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

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

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 555) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 4, 2020, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 560.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 560) recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 560) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 6, 2020, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 18, 2020

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 18; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired and the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume the consideration of the Rash nomination. Finally, notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Rash nomination occur at 5:30 p.m.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks from the Senator from the great State of Alaska.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO ADAM CRUM AND DR. ANNE ZINK

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is Thursday, and I am back on the Senate

floor, partaking in one of my favorite times of the week, which is to come down to the floor and talk about somebody who is making a great difference in my State. We call this individual our Alaskan of the Week. To those who watch the floor back home, sometimes we break the rules a little bit and recognize more than one person. We just call them the Alaskans of the Week, with an “s.” Pandemic or no pandemic, I think it is still important that we come down and recognize, particularly during these challenging times, people who are making a difference in our State and across our country.

As I mentioned last week, this pandemic is definitely testing the character of our Nation. You might remember, right when it was hitting, some reporters from the Washington Post wrote a story, saying that Americans are going to be tested and that they don't think they are going to be able to pass—maybe not like they had in World War II and at other times—that the mettle, the toughness, and the resiliency of Americans might not be able to get us through this. That was the Washington Post—classic, clueless, inside-the-beltway reporting.

In my remarks on the floor—this was about 6 weeks ago—I said: You ought to come up to Alaska, Washington Post, and see my constituents, or maybe come out with my marines and see the marines.

You have to know America. Alaska is America, and we are going to pass this test as a nation, and we are—all across the country and certainly in my great State. In small, rural villages and in urban centers, from the tundra to the rainforests, all across the State, people are helping each other. They are passing out food. They are helping the elderly, making sure they are not lonely. They are tending to those in need and are displaying generosity, strength, and amazing resilience. The paper should write more about that.

Our frontline workers have now become our national heroes. Some of them are working day in and day out to ensure that our grocery stores are stocked, that the goods are transported, that the buildings are maintained, that our telecommunication systems are running, that our airplanes are flying, that our hospitals are open, and that our community healthcare workers can give care. The list, as we all know, goes on and on and on.

Because of those back home, because of these great Americans all around our country, and because of what is happening in my State with our State's leadership, Alaska has done well from a health standpoint in terms of this virus. Knock on wood, of course—and I am doing it—things could change. They could change anywhere. They certainly could change in Alaska, but so far so good.

Alaskans are known for their rugged individualism. Alaskans are not naturally people who automatically follow

orders without having a good reason to do so, but almost everybody across our State has taken this virus seriously in their helping one another and in their following the guidance that has been given by our State's leaders. I chalk that up to good leadership from our very attentive mayors—city mayors, borough mayors—to our local leaders across the State, to our Governor, Mike Dunleavy, and to the healthcare team he put together in his administration that was ready when this pandemic hit.

I am going to talk about the healthcare team. It has been led by the commissioner of the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services, Adam Crum, and by Alaska's chief medical officer, Dr. Anne Zink. Both of them are our Alaskans of the week. They have both worked day and night throughout these past several weeks since this pandemic has hit our Nation, has hit my State, and they have been trying around the clock to keep our fellow Alaskans safe. As I mentioned, both are more than deserving of this very, very prestigious award. They have risen to the challenge in so many impressive ways in working for their State and their country.

As Alaskans do, both of them have interesting life stories, compelling life stories. Let me tell you a little bit about both of them.

Adam Crum lives in Wasilla with Colleen, his wife. He was born and raised in Alaska. He grew up on the Kenai Peninsula and went to Homer High School. He was a graduate there and a good football player. He went to Northwestern and walked on the football team. That is Big Ten football. That takes a lot of guts—center, guard, offensive lineman. He did great there.

In fact, look at the Crums, his siblings. They are a big family—impressive, a big group. There are brains and brawn in that family. Adam's three brothers all played college ball—Joey at Puget Sound, Richie at the University of Idaho, and Cody at West Texas A&M. Their dad also played at the University of Arkansas. Like I said, when you line up the Crum brothers, you look like you have a serious pro-football offensive line right there. It is an impressive family.

Adam enjoyed Northwestern and playing ball there, but on his first visit back home from college, he began to realize just how unique the great State of Alaska was where he grew up. He said: "For me, I really didn't appreciate it until I actually went somewhere else."

Like all of us who love the outdoors, the scenery, the diversity, the opportunities, when he moved back from college, he was committed to coming back to our State to serve our State. He went into his family business. He got his master's degree in public health from Johns Hopkins University. Then, when Governor Dunleavy, whom I mentioned, was elected in November of 2018, Adam was offered the job of com-

missioner of Health and Social Services.

His starting date was going to be December 3, 2018, but in Alaska, there are always adventures and challenges, and on November 30, the south central part of our State got hit with a huge shock, a huge earthquake—7.1. There were cracking and collapsing roads and highways. It damaged buildings, destroyed schools, knocked out power, and sent people scrambling outside and under furniture. It really damaged homes. So Adam, who was going to start this job in 3 days, said: I am going to start now. He moved up the start date and got to work.

It was a crash course in health emergency operations. Brand new on the job, his Health and Human Services department was in touch with all the hospitals, all the prisons, the elder care facilities, the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs. He watched and led these operations, everybody working together. Here is the miracle: In this huge earthquake during rush hour in Alaska, not one life was lost. It was remarkable—literally a miracle. He learned how to bring people together in emergency operations. That exercise was invaluable with what came next, and we all know what came next—the pandemic which has rocked our State, our country, and really our world.

Alaska's chief medical officer, Dr. Anne Zink, appears with Commissioner Adam Crum and Governor Dunleavy nearly every night to address Alaskans and our media in a press conference about where we are with regard to the health of our State and this coronavirus. Versions of this scene happen nearly every night across the country as Governors are addressing their public. But I am willing to venture to say that if there is a marker of success with such briefings, it is this: how much the people are trusting of what is being told to them. I would state that Alaska's healthcare team, Commissioner Crum and Dr. Zink, have passed with flying colors.

Dr. Zink is certainly one of the stars of this nightly show as she appears from her yurt in her backyard in Palmer, AK. She has become so popular in Alaska that there is even a Facebook page dedicated to her called "Think like Zink." Rorie Watt, Juneau's city manager, actually wrote an ode in her honor. It is a lengthy poem, and it starts like this:

Oh Alaska, I love you and it feels like we are teetering on the brink; who can guide and steer us? The unflappable Dr. Zink!

You know if a poem is written about you, you are doing a good job.

Dr. Zink was raised in Colorado with physician parents. She was no stranger to Alaska. She worked as a mountaineering guide in Alaska during college. So after getting her M.D. from Stanford, she made her way back to our great State 11 years ago and has worked as an ER doctor in the Matanuska Valley.

Last July, she was with her family in Bhutan on a yearlong sabbatical when

she got a call from Adam Crum, asking her to come to be the State's Chief Medical Officer. Commissioner Crum, speaking like a true Big Ten football player, said: "She was my number 1 draft pick."

So Commissioner Crum made the smart decision to bring on Dr. Zink to the medical team and healthcare team that he leads. Commissioner Crum and Dr. Zink have, along with the rest of the country, been closely watching the virus migrate from China to the United States since the early stages. Remember what happened when the State Department brought our diplomats home from Wuhan. A planeload of our diplomats were coming home, and they had to stop in Anchorage on January 28 for a refueling stop. We later learned that nobody on the plane actually had the virus, but Commissioner Crum and Dr. Zink started to get our State ready. They prepared for the worst, contacting local and Tribal medical facilities. They were in constant coordination with the CDC. They were in communications with all the State agencies and divisions and, very, very importantly, with the public.

This began their outreach to our citizens. They have continued that frenzied pace ever since, working day and night with the Governor's office to try their best to keep the virus at bay, to keep our citizens healthy, and so far it is working.

Like other places, businesses in Alaska have been shut down and are now slowly beginning to open back up. We need to open back up. We need to keep our citizens healthy, but we need to get our economy open and moving again.

Among the other precautions, the Governor established a ban for a time on travel throughout the State and a 14-day quarantine still in place for anybody who comes from outside of Alaska to the State. Commissioner Crum said that mandate was probably the most effective thing they have done so far to keep the virus from spreading.

Again, that doesn't mean it can't flare up in Alaska. It has flared up in other parts of our country. For example, we have some 200 villages that are not connected by roads and many of which do not have healthcare facilities. If they do have them, they are very, very limited. These communities were hit very hard by the Spanish flu, so there is a lot of trepidation in rural Alaska.

We have a fishing season that will start and will begin to bring people in from out of State—thousands of people—to work in Alaska. This is very important for our economy, but the communities need to feel safe. I have raised this issue with the President, the Vice President, and the Chief of Staff, and to their credit they have responded.

As a matter of fact, right now we have a doctor from DHS who is going around the State, with Dr. Zink and others, who was sent there by Admiral Brett Giroir, the HHS Assistant Secretary, in charge of testing. They are

all out there. They are going to be in Kodiak, Bristol Bay, and Cordova, trying to make sure that our fishing communities are ready.

When the admiral called me, he said: We are working with the State, Senator SULLIVAN. This direction is from the highest senior officials in the White House to get out there and bring resources to your fishing communities, and I will say, working with Dr. Zink, she is one of the top medical officers in the country. This is Admiral Giroir speaking about Dr. Zink.

So as you can tell, the utmost diligence is required and so is planning, communication, and bringing people along, particularly when you are asking them to take extreme measures. Again, because of the leadership we have, it is something that I think so far is going well in our State.

Commissioner Crum said:

Alaskans are contrarian by nature. They want to be educated. They don't want to be forced. When they were told that it was the right thing to do, to comply with the mandates—that if we do this now, it will hurt less later—they did it.

Alaskans did this. Commissioner Crum continued:

It was the most painful thing I've ever done—asking people to close their businesses. But not as painful as it was for the people who actually had to shut down their business. But Alaskans complied and we worked together.

True leaders emerge during times of crisis. We are grateful that these two leaders emerged for us in Alaska. They are working, along with the Governor and the rest of his team, to do a very good job for our State.

Like I said, we aren't past this. We have enormous challenges in our Nation and huge economic challenges in our State, but we know a few things. We have good people at the top who are guiding us, and we know that Alaskans will do the right thing when they are asked by these people. We also know that we are resilient, our State, our people, and our Nation.

In a recent interview, Dr. Zink said that one of her big takeaways throughout this entire pandemic is just how important resilience is and how very resilient Alaska is. She said, "Adversity can bring out the best and worst in people, and we have a choice to grow in response to the challenges or crumble from them."

Well, as I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, I am convinced that Alaska will grow from these challenges and that America will grow from these challenges, and I am convinced that what we are seeing all around our State and our Nation is amazing generosity, people working together through these difficult times. We will emerge stronger and more resilient.

So I want to thank two leaders in our State who are responsible, in many ways, for getting us through, so far so good, on the health side, Commissioner Crum and Dr. Zink. Thank you for your service. Thank you for your hard work and your sacrifice. Thank you for stepping up and congratulations on being our Alaskans of the Week.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 18, 2020, AT 3 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until Monday at 3 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:21 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 18, 2020, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KEITH W. DAYTON, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO UKRAINE.

THE JUDICIARY

JOHN C. TRUONG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE WENDELL P. GARDNER, JR., RETIRED.

DANNY LAM NGUYEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE CAROL A. DALTON, RETIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 14, 2020:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. AARON R. DEAN II

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL W. BANK
COL. MONICA M. BROUSE
COL. ALLAN R. CECIL
COL. MICHAEL A. COMSTOCK
COL. KEVIN V. DOYLE
COL. AKSHAI M. GANDHI
COL. THOMAS C. HANNON
COL. THOMAS J. JAMES
COL. DAVID W. MANSON
COL. JOHN J. PTAK, JR.
COL. MICHAEL D. STOHLER
COL. EDWIN A. VANDERWOLDE
COL. MARK A. VAVRA

IN THE ARMY

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

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GARY M. BRITO

IN THE NAVY

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

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) CARL P. CHEBI
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID A. GOGGINS
REAR ADM. (LH) DOUGLAS W. SMALL

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RICK FREEDMAN

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SUSAN BRYERJOYNER
CAPT. JOHN A. WATKINS

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARK A. MELSON
CAPT. MICHAEL S. SCIRETTA

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

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. EUGENE H. BLACK III

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM P. ABOTT AND ENDING WITH D015041, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 4, 2020.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVIS M. ABT AND ENDING WITH D014989, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 4, 2020.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMIE E. ABEL AND ENDING WITH D014063, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 4, 2020.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADESOLO O. ADEPEGBA AND ENDING WITH G010437, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 4, 2020.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAMAL D. SNELL, TO BE MAJOR. ARMY NOMINATION OF KELLY L. FRENCH, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM A. FORBES, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY T. JONES II AND ENDING WITH JUAN F. RODRIGUEZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 6, 2020.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW S. BREEN AND ENDING WITH REYES J. RIVAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 4, 2020.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRETT D. ABBAMONTE AND ENDING WITH JASON C. YURISIC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 4, 2020.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA D. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH SCOTT W. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 2, 2020.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF DANIEL M. WIEGREFE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KATHERINE L. JAUDON, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PAUL D. SARGENT, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER C. SUPKO, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JAMES G. BUCKLEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL G. MATSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KEVAN M. MELLENDICK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ANDREW S. MORRIS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ANDREW D. CORDREY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS R. LEINWEBER, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SEAN A. MCKAY, TO BE CAPTAIN.