



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2020

No. 133

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 29, 2020, at 9 a.m.

Senate

TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2020

The Senate met at 10 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.

Eternal God, our rock of safety, hear our prayers. Help us to live that the generations to come will know of Your mighty acts.

Today, give our lawmakers the hearts to seek, find, and follow Your will. Lord, guide them in the path You have created, inspiring them with the potency of Your powerful presence. May they trust You in adversity and prosperity, knowing that they will reap a productive harvest if they persevere.

Lord, we trust You to lead us with Your loving providence.

We pray in Your merciful 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I want to talk about the World Trade Organization. I have said what I am going to say now before. So I want to say it again: The United States must reaffirm its commitment to significant reform of the World Trade Organization. The United States must move to revitalize that organization because the World Trade Organization advances the cause of free and fair global trade, and they necessarily do it because of the modern economy we are in.

It is imperative that we continue to double down on the efforts that demonstrate the United States' leadership at Geneva, the headquarters of the World Trade Organization. That includes our efforts to reform the World Trade Organization appellate body, to work on subsidies that too many countries are using, and to continue ongoing negotiations to accomplish these goals.

The World Trade Organization can and should play an important role in the global economic recovery from our virus pandemic. I urge the administration and my colleagues here in the Senate to advocate for our interests. I urge the Trump administration to confront trade distortions, and most importantly, this administration must encourage all World Trade Organization members to unite in an effort to lift us out of the nearly unprecedented global downturn we have had in trade because of the virus pandemic.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

HEALS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yesterday, Senate Republicans put forward the HEALS Act, our framework for another round of historic relief for American workers and families.

Our Nation stands at a challenging crossroads. We have one foot in this pandemic and one foot in the recovery. We can't go back to April, and until we have a vaccine, we can't go back to normal either. What the American people need is smart, safe, and sustainable middle ground, and they need Congress's help to construct it. That is exactly what our major proposal would do.

Everyone knows that another rescue package will need to be bipartisan to pass the Senate. So the question before the country is now really quite simple: Are we going to see the versions of House and Senate Democrats that helped us unanimously pass the CARES Act back in March, or are we, instead, going to see the same Democrats who decided to block police reform in June and lash out at Senator TIM SCOTT's proposal instead of working with him to make law? In other words, do the Speaker of the House and the Democratic leader believe that struggling Americans deserve an outcome, or do they want to stay on the sidelines and recite talking points?

Well, yesterday, even before the Democrats had seen our legislation,

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4515

they began attacking it. All the tired, old partisan tropes were trotted out. Before releasing a proposal that wants to give schools even more reopening money than the House Democrats' bill and which would continue additional unemployment benefits at eight times the dollar amount Democrats established during the last crisis, we were informed here on the floor that "those Republican hard-right money people . . . don't want the Federal Government to help anybody."

This is beyond parody.

Republicans put forward a trillion-dollar proposal for kids, jobs, and healthcare, including direct cash to households, and even more cash to unemployed people. And the Democrats say it proves we don't want to help people. They say it proves we don't want to help people. These are not serious statements. It is politics as usual, with talking points that went stale 20 years ago.

But the week is young and the HEALS Act is full of provisions I would, frankly, dare my Democratic colleagues to actually say they oppose.

Republicans want to extend supplemental unemployment insurance at hundreds of dollars per week. If Democrats block legislation, it will stop all together.

Republicans want to send thousands of dollars more to American families through direct payments. If Democrats will not come to the table, they will get nothing.

Republicans want to use tax incentives to encourage the rehiring of laid-off workers and the creation of safer workplaces through things like testing, remodeling, and PPE. If Democrats block action, workers will be on their own.

Republicans want to specifically protect Medicare seniors from a spike in premiums because of COVID. If Democrats treat the HEALS Act the way they treated police reform, seniors will be on their own as well.

Republicans want to pour money into K-12 schools and give greater flexibility to childcare providers so America's kids can have a safe but more normal school year. If Democrats block action, school districts will get none of us.

Republicans want to create a second targeted round of PPE to keep small businesses above water. If Democrats will not negotiate, the "now open" signs will come down and the "going out of business" signs will replace them.

Republicans want to proactively expand our domestic manufacturing capability for masks and PPE and medical countermeasures. If Democrats refuse to negotiate, we will be just as dependent on adversaries as competitors in the next crisis.

Republicans want to protect doctors, nurses, school districts, and universities from a second epidemic of frivolous lawsuits. If Democrats don't come to the table, our Nation's reopening will be at the mercy of trial lawyers.

Republicans want to go even further to backstop hospitals and healthcare providers and fuel the sprint for vaccines. If Democrats will not let us, Americans will just have to cross our fingers and hope the medical system remains stable.

To be clear, Republicans are not proposing to "cut" any relief. Under current law, expanded UI expires and is replaced with nothing. Under current law, there are no more direct payments and no second PPP. Every single thing we put forward is a way to get more relief into people's hands.

Our Democratic colleagues want to pretend it is controversial, somehow, that taxpayers should not pay people more not to work than people who do go back to work. They want to pretend it is controversial that taxpayers should not pay people more not to work than people who do go back to work? The American people don't call it a controversy. They call it common sense. They call it basic fairness.

This is absolutely a time to be generous and provide additional Federal relief to people who have been laid off, but we should not be redistributing money away from the essential workers who have remained at their posts.

We should not be taxing somebody who has been stocking shelves for months so the government can pay their neighbor more than she makes to sit at home. That is what we are talking about—taxing essential workers to pay their neighbors a bonus to stay home.

One study by university economists just found these benefits can exceed people's previous incomes two-thirds of the time. They found a medium recipient earns 134 percent of their prior salary. That means half are making even more than that. That is just not fair. It is not compatible with a reopening economy and more than 6 in 10 Americans feel this creates a disincentive to work.

Even the Democratic House majority leader said just this morning that our perspective "has some validity to it and we have to deal with that . . . it's not \$600 or bust." That was the majority leader in the House. The Democratic majority leader in the House said: "It's not \$600 or bust." So let's get past these partisan cheap shots and have an adult conversation.

Look at it this way. Think about one street, one block in one neighborhood, anywhere in America. Think how they would benefit if this bill were signed into law. Right now, several families on that block probably have no idea whether their kids will be heading back to school in a few weeks. Our bill would provide the money and legal certainty for school districts to reopen safely.

Let's talk about the families' pocket-books. Likely, every mailbox on that street or each checking account would get another \$1,200 per adult and \$500 per dependent. For a family of four, we are talking about \$3,400 in cash. Maybe some of these homeowners are among

the millions of Americans who have been thrown into joblessness. As we discussed, they would get hundreds of dollars more every week in added unemployment.

But because we are doing it smarter, if anyone on the street owns a coffee shop or a contracting business, they will not hear from workers that they are earning more by staying at home. Those unemployed workers will get back on the job faster when our bill supercharges incentives for rehiring and helps pay for health and safety in the workplace.

Maybe some other people on the street have held onto their jobs because of the historic Paycheck Protection Program. Their employer is considering closing down with that relief nearly exhausted. Our targeted second round of PPP could keep their paycheck coming instead of a pink slip. Maybe a retired couple lives on this block. If our proposal for Medicare Part B premiums becomes law, this couple will be protected from a spike in costs due to this pandemic, and needless to say, every single person on that street would benefit from even stronger Federal investments in the diagnostics, treatments, and vaccines that will ultimately win this healthcare battle for all of us.

So, look, it is very simple. Partisan histrionics will not get any American family any of the relief I just described. Calling names will not get school districts one dime. Washington finger-pointing will not add 1 cent to anyone's unemployment check.

The Democrats face a simple choice. They can come to the table, work with the Republicans, and engage seriously to make law for the American people or they can stay on the sidelines, point fingers, and let another rescue package go the same way as the police reform bill they killed back in June. The Republicans are ready to govern. We just need the Democrats to decide whether they are serious about actually making law.

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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Cleveland Joseph, of Louisiana, to be United

States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, yesterday, after putting the Senate on pause for 3 months and after months of blocking nearly every Democratic attempt to pass legislation related to the coronavirus, the Senate Republicans finally revealed their long overdue proposal for the next phase of COVID relief.

In my many years of serving in this Chamber, I have never seen a Republican majority—a Senate majority of any type—respond to a national emergency in such a disorganized and disoriented fashion. Weeks of infighting among Senate Republicans and the White House caused unnecessary and harmful delays.

Instead of presenting a single, unified bill, the Republicans released several separate drafts last night, and there might be more today. They can't agree on one bill. They can't get 51 votes for anything that is comprehensive and that deals with the very real problems the American people face. Even before the Republicans announced their bills, senior Republican Senators admitted they lacked the full support of the Republicans. Two Republican chairmen have said that probably half of the Republican Senate will vote against their own proposals. Worst of all, the Republican plan falls dreadfully short. It is ununified, unserious, and completely unsatisfactory.

My Republican friends, this is the greatest crisis America has faced in generations—100 years since the last health crisis of this magnitude, 75 years since the Great Depression—and you are paying attention to your corporate friends and not answering the needs of the people.

We Democrats want a real bill that answers people's needs, that deals with the serious problems we face. That is what we are fighting for. We will keep fighting for it, and our Republican friends are nowhere to be found.

While the Republican proposal fails to provide crucial relief for families, workers, and the unemployed, it is littered with corporate giveaways, K Street handouts, and Presidential pet projects. The Republican bill includes a \$20 billion slush fund for large agribusiness and tax breaks for three-martini lunches, but it doesn't provide a dime in food assistance for hungry kids. It includes an unprecedented, sweeping provision to shield corpora-

tions for 5 years from liability for negligent treatment of workers and consumers, but there is no new, sweeping provision to shield Americans from evictions or foreclosures.

It includes a \$30 billion wish list for defense contractors but no funding to make sure Americans can vote safely in November. There are reports that the Republican proposal may include a provision to lower capital standards at the Wall Street big banks but nothing to help State, local, and Tribal governments keep teachers, firefighters, and busdrivers on the job.

The Senate Republicans managed to sneak in nearly \$2 billion in taxpayer funds for a new FBI building, the location of which will increase the value of the Trump hotel and enrich the President and his family. Yes. In this proposal, the Senate Republicans reward the President and his family's business interests but not our essential workers.

Whom do my Republican friends need to help more—President Trump, who proudly claims he is a billionaire, or a worker who is about to lose his job, a small businessperson whose business is going under, or a family who can't feed hungry children? Who needs the help more—they or President Trump?

Perhaps, worst of all, in the middle of the pandemic, the Senate Republicans and the White House want to give out-of-work Americans a 30-percent pay cut. If you have lost your job through no fault of your own and you can't go back to work because the administration bungled this crisis, the Senate Republicans propose taking \$1,600 out of your pocket every single month.

Well, let me show my colleagues what New Yorkers think of the Republican proposal: Let them eat cake. GOP plan slices \$600 check and rejects aid to states. Let them eat cake. That is what New Yorkers think. That is what Americans think. Let them eat cake. Shame. Shame on our Republican friends.

The cover of the New York Daily News sums it up. Let them eat cake. "Let them eat cake" sums up the Republican proposal in response to the greatest economic crisis in 75 years. Let them eat cake.

People can't feed their kids. People are losing their homes, getting kicked out of their apartments. Small businesses are going under. The Republican response? Let them eat cake.

Who are the Republicans fighting for in this proposal? Tax breaks for three-martini lunches but no food assistance for the poor? Immunity for corporations but no immunity for Americans facing eviction? Twenty, thirty million unemployed Americans and Republicans say take a 30-percent pay cut? Who are the Republicans fighting for in this proposal?

If you are a big bank, a defense contractor, a member of the Trump family, the Republican proposal has some good news for you, but if you can barely afford the rent, can't find work, can't feed your kids, or are fighting for

your family's future, the Republican plan leaves you out in the cold.

The consequences of the Republican policy on unemployment alone would be disastrous. Those enhanced benefits have kept 12 million Americans out of poverty. Those enhanced benefits are the one bright spot in this declining economy—that consumer spending is going up now, in large part because of pandemic unemployment insurance as well as PPP.

One of the few things that has kept our economy from deteriorating further is that these unemployment benefits have boosted consumer spending. That is why economists say the Republican proposal could cost over 1 million jobs this year and 3.4 million jobs next year. The Republican proposal is causing us to lose even more jobs.

States have warned us that the Republican plan on unemployment is unworkable, to boot. We called State unemployment offices yesterday to ask them what would happen if the Republicans passed this new scheme. One State office simply said: Chaos. Chaos. Office after office said it would take weeks, months to even implement the new plan. What are people going to do during those weeks and months when they are not getting unemployment insurance?

The idea on the Republican side that we have to slash unemployment benefits because otherwise Americans won't go back to work is exaggerated. Americans want to work, are ready to work, and are desperate to get back to work. Such little faith in the American people. Such a bad outlook on human nature. People want to work, Republican friends; they just don't have jobs to do it, and we are not going to let them starve while that happens.

God forbid we provide tens of millions of unemployed Americans a lifeline until we defeat this disease and get our economy back on its feet seems to be the Republican attitude. The Republicans seem to think the American people are a bunch of loafers. Well, they are not.

Now, we Democrats want to get something done. We are certainly frustrated with the dithering, the disunity, and the lack of understanding of the depth of the crisis coming from the Republican side, but that will not stop us. We must press on with bipartisan negotiations. Time is running out. We cannot afford to fail. But the Republican new proposal is not an adequate starting point.

History is repeating itself. Each time we came together in the past to pass COVID 2, COVID 3, and COVID 3.5, it was because both parties sat down with each other and negotiated and did the hard work. But that was only after Republicans dared us and put an inadequate proposal on the floor and said: We will blame you. We held firm. They came back. We negotiated a much better bill. My hope, my belief, is that they will have to do that again.

Leader McCONNELL is in his "Alice in Wonderland" characterizations here on

the floor. I can't believe them. He keeps insisting that a bipartisan spirit led to the CARES Act, but he skips over the fact that he dropped a partisan bill on the floor, and Democrats had to insist on continuing negotiating to make the bill significantly better. There is a lot of revisionist history going on on the other side of the aisle.

This morning, MCCONNELL continued with his "Alice in Wonderland" logic, suggesting that Democrats are going to be the ones standing in the way of more relief. Let's not forget that Republicans dithered for 3 months while Democrats pleaded for action on COVID. Speaker PELOSI and I wrote to Leader MCCONNELL 3 weeks ago and said: Let's sit down and talk. We didn't hear a peep out of him.

When Republicans finally woke up to the calamity in our country, they bickered among themselves for a week, as the country approached several cliffs—unemployment, eviction, State and local government, and more. Now that the Republicans finally have a proposal, it is corporate-focused, doesn't meet the needs of the American people, and half of their own caucus probably won't support it anyway.

Leader MCCONNELL, a few minutes ago, said: If Democrats don't want to negotiate a bill—I will remind the leader that last night, Chief of Staff Meadows, Secretary Mnuchin, Speaker PELOSI, and I were in the Speaker's office negotiating. Why didn't Mnuchin and Meadows bring MCCONNELL along? Because the Senate Republicans can't get their act together and produce a unified position.

So, Leader MCCONNELL, I have a suggestion: Instead of blaming Democrats, how about Senate Republicans and Leader MCCONNELL get their act together, roll up their sleeves, and actually get to do real work and solve these problems.

Every time—every time we have come to pass critical relief, Democrats have forced our Republican colleagues and the White House to come to the table and negotiate in a serious way. That is what we have to do again. We need bipartisan, bicameral negotiations to produce a bill that meets the needs of the American people. We Democrats will continue to do that.

Speaker PELOSI and I will be meeting with Mnuchin and Meadows again tonight in an effort to try to get a bill because the needs of the American people, the American economy, and the American health are so great. Let's come together and get something done. America desperately needs our help.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague and leader on the Democratic side, Senator SCHUMER, for his specific, articulate, and direct analysis of where we stand today in the Senate.

Faced with the worst public health crisis in 100 years, faced with the worst

economic crisis in 75 to 80 years, the message from the Republican side of the aisle is "Think small. Do as little as possible. Let's see how this works out."

At a time when we have unemployment figures breaking all records, when we have 10 times the unemployment claims in Illinois that we did a year ago—I might add, 10 times the unemployment claims in the Commonwealth of Kentucky that they did a year ago—we, instead, are hearing from the Republican side of the aisle that the problem with our economy is not unemployment; it is the fact that the people who are unemployed are being given too much money.

Right now we have a Federal benefit package worth \$600 a week that was enacted in the CARES Act on March 26. That expires in 3 days. It is a \$600-a-week Federal supplement over the State payment. What the Republicans have suggested is to cut that \$600 Federal supplement to \$200, and then they turn and say: Well, what we really want to do is to compensate the workers with 70 percent of what they were earning when they were laid off.

There is a real serious problem here that they are not disclosing to the American people. Back in March, when we proposed a similar approach or one that took into consideration the previous wages of an unemployed worker, who told us to stop that consideration? President Trump's Secretary of Labor. Secretary Scalia came to us, and I was at the meeting when he said: You don't understand. You cannot make this kind of change in the States because there are 50 different computer systems in the employment security offices across each and every State in the Union. They cannot make this adjustment. They cannot make this change.

The only way, they told us—Secretary Scalia told us in March—is a flat dollar amount to each unemployed worker, which is exactly what we did.

Now the Republicans come to us and ignore that advice, ignore that guidance that led to \$600 a week, and say: We will come up with an elaborate formula of 70 percent of what you were paid before.

As Senator SCHUMER from New York said earlier, we surveyed a dozen States, and they all told us: Impossible to 5 or 6 months before we are ready to do something in that manner. And that means, for millions of Americans currently unemployed, the possibility of only receiving \$200 a week until someday in the future when the State unemployment systems can possibly change. That is the Republican approach.

They have made a big point, as Senator MCCONNELL did this morning on the floor, of a \$1,200 check, a cash payment such as we had back in March. I am not opposed to that. The President is desperate for it because he gets to sign the checks. He wants his signature on the checks that are going out to these individuals.

Well, Mr. President, if that is what you want, be my guest if it is going to

help working families. But make no mistake—a \$1,200 check to a family who was receiving \$600 a week, \$2,400 a month, is cold comfort, and it won't help them pay the bills they face every single month.

I only wish that the Republicans who are calling for these dramatic cuts in unemployment compensation for millions of Americans—30 million Americans—I only wish they would go home to Kentucky and other States and sit down for a meal with an unemployed family and let them tell these Republicans what they are facing each and every month, trying to get by, even with this unemployment check.

You see, there is an assumption that these people have a lot of money in savings. It is not reality. In the real world, half of American families have little or no savings to turn to—even before this current economic downturn. Imagine what they are going through now and the sacrifices they have to make.

Surely the Republican leaders have heard the stories or seen firsthand, as I have, the families showing up at food banks and pantries, looking for a helping hand to put something on the table to feed their families, some of them with their eyes down to the ground, tears in those eyes because they never dreamed they would be in this position in life. And what is the alternative suggested from the Republican side? Cut the unemployment compensation for millions of Americans at this moment in history. Think small, Republicans say. We can get through this by doing as little as possible.

That is not true. We have been told over and over again that if we take our foot off the accelerator to try to move this economy out of the ditch, it will crash even further, and we don't want that to happen. We want people to get back to work and businesses to reopen and schools to reopen, but we have to do the right thing in terms of providing compensation to individuals.

I reject the premise that many Republicans bring to this conversation that if you are not rich, you must be lazy in America. I don't think unemployed people in this country are lazy people. I think they are hard-working people who have been dealt a tough hand of cards. They are trying to keep their families together until they can get back to work and to a decent job. Cutting unemployment compensation at this moment in history is cruel, inhumane, and insensitive to the realities these families are facing every single day.

There is one provision that came out yesterday that I want to speak to for a moment. For months, literally for months, Senator MCCONNELL has come to the floor and criticized Speaker PELOSI for her efforts to pass the Heroes Act almost 10 weeks ago. Ten weeks ago, the House of Representatives, under Speaker PELOSI, passed legislation to provide COVID-19 relief that we knew was coming because we

knew the unemployment benefits were going to expire in just a few days. She saw that coming and 10 weeks ago did what was the right thing to do. She mustered her troops and provided a majority to vote for a package that moves us forward, helps State and local governments face the reality of this economy, helps hospitals, and helps individuals pay for their health insurance—a good package and one that I could readily support.

Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor frequently, regularly, several times a week, saying how bad that package was, how terrible it was, while he did nothing, while the Republicans proposed no alternative. It is just like the Affordable Care Act. They have done everything they can 150 times to try to repeal it and never once proposed an alternative. The same thing is true when it comes to this COVID-19 relief. In this circumstance we received finally, yesterday, this proposal that was brought by Senator CORNYN on behalf of himself and Senator MCCONNELL to address the issue of the immunity of corporations from lawsuits that have any relation to COVID-19—immunity for these corporations so that they will not be held liable if, in fact, they are not performing up to the standards necessary to protect employees and customers.

It is 65 pages long. It is a big giveaway to the biggest corporations in America. The Republican corporate immunity bill does nothing to protect workers, improve safety standards, or give business incentives to take proper precautions to reduce the spread of the coronavirus.

In fact, this bill does the opposite. It views workers and victims as the problem, and it sets high hurdles that prevent meritorious COVID-related crimes from having their day in court. What the bill would do is impose sweeping Federal preemption on the rights of workers and victims to bring cases in State courts for COVID-related harm. It would supplant State laws that require businesses to act with reasonable care. Then it would say that businesses are shielded from liability in Federal court if they merely make an effort to comply with the weakest available mandatory safety standard that applies to them so long as they are not grossly negligent.

So what are the kinds of safety standards that the bill would urge businesses to follow? Well, it certainly wouldn't be the guidelines of the Centers for Disease Control because those aren't mandatory. So, amazingly, a business can get shielded from liability under this Republican approach even if they make no effort to comply with the Centers for Disease Control guidelines. How does that make us any safer?

Not only that, but if workers or sick Americans want to try to bring a meritorious COVID-related case in this bill, this bill puts them through a gauntlet of tort reform obstacles that will make it nearly impossible to prevail: a

heightened burden of proof, heightened pleading requirements, limits on discovery, damage caps, restrictions on joint and several liability, and so much more. The Republican bill also creates sweeping Federal preemption of medical malpractice cases, including claims under medical malpractice not even related to COVID-19. It would upend the medical liability laws of all 50 States for 5 years.

Instead of sending a strong, clear, and enforceable Federal safety standard like an OSHA emergency temporary standard, the Republican bill would actually shield businesses from regulatory enforcement proceedings under OSHA, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and more.

The liability immunity under this bill would last for 5 years, from December 2019 to 2024. The fact that Republicans are proposing 5 years of liability immunity for corporations while promising just a few months of assistance for workers tells the whole story about priorities and values.

Let's be clear. Republicans have not made the case for why we would even consider Federal liability immunity for corporations. Remember, under current State tort law, if a business has taken reasonable precautions, it will not be held liable for negligence. State laws give incentives for businesses to act reasonably, and most businesses do. Also, time and again, I have heard Senator MCCONNELL and Senator CORNYN come to the floor and talk about the tsunami of lawsuits. This morning Senator MCCONNELL said "an epidemic" of frivolous lawsuits.

It so happens we keep track of lawsuits filed in the United States of America, and we can look to the pleadings in those lawsuits to see how many times they mention coronavirus or COVID-19. We know how many lawsuits have been filed since the first of the year related to this pandemic. We know that despite the fact that 4 million—at least 4 million—COVID-19 infections have been established in the United States—4 million—do you know how many medical malpractice cases have been filed by any of those 4 million Americans or anyone else against doctors, nurses, hospitals, and providers? What is the epidemic number? We have it. Here is the exact number of medical malpractice cases filed in the United States in the last 6 months: six—six. An epidemic? A tsunami?

How about personal injury lawsuits, Senator? How many have been filed listing COVID-19 or coronavirus as one of the reasons for these lawsuits? Fifteen. With 4 million infected Americans, there are 15 lawsuits, and the Republicans have come to us and want to turn upside down the immunity and liability questions before the States and the Nation.

How about unsafe workplace lawsuits? Now, that has to be a big category. With 4 million infected Americans, how many workers have brought

lawsuits? Seventy-one. In the entire 50 States of America, there are 71 lawsuits.

There is no flood of worker or victim lawsuits. It is a figment of the imagination of Senator MCCONNELL, Senator CORNYN, and K Street. But we certainly shouldn't, at this moment in time, ignore the obvious. Over 20 States have stepped forward and established their own standards for lawsuits when it comes to the pandemic they face. This effort by the Republicans would preempt that State action. There have been hundreds and hundreds of COVID lawsuits that have been filed, business to business, on questions like insurance liability. You don't hear the Republicans wanting to stop businesses from filing lawsuits—no, just workers and the people who get sick.

There is no need for the Federal Government to step in and override 50 States' liability laws, especially after the Federal Government has been deferring to the States on every other aspect of this pandemic: testing, PPE, masks, stay-at-home orders. Time and again, this President has said to leave it to the Governors and leave it to the mayors, except when it comes to protecting big corporations. If States need to adjust their liability laws, they can do so, and 28 States have already done it.

So here is the bottom line. The Republican immunity bill would upend State laws, give businesses incentives to cut corners, jeopardize the safety of workers and families, and risk further spread of this virus. It is a big business giveaway, and that is not what America needs.

This is not a small challenge; it is a historic challenge. We shouldn't take the Republican lead and play small ball. We ought to address this head-on.

First, we need leadership from the top, which we have not had from the President. He has deferred time and again to Governors and mayors and other officials at the local levels, telling them: Find your own masks. Establish your own testing regimes. Find your own way out of this crisis.

When we needed Federal leadership from the President, we did not receive it. America knows that. Why is it that this Nation, with 5 percent of the world's population, has 25 percent of the COVID infection cases in the world? Why? What happened here? Why didn't we follow the lead of other countries that stepped up with Presidential leadership—countries that have found dramatically less infection, dramatically fewer deaths. That is the reality of where we are today with this pandemic.

The reality of our economy—we stepped in on March 26 and passed the CARES Act. We have managed to keep some businesses going. We have managed to keep millions of unemployed Americans together with their families through the most difficult period in their lives. Now, at this moment, the Republican leadership says: Think

small. This is all going to pass quickly. Don't worry about these families who don't have enough to provide food and shelter and the basics for their families. They will get by with a lot less—from \$600 a week to \$200 a week. They will do just fine, according to Republicans.

I disagree. Our first obligation should be to these working families who are going through the toughest period they could ever imagine. Stick with them. Stand with them. Be prepared to put the money on the table, which we know they will spend right back into the economy.

We will see more unemployment if we follow the Republican approach. It is estimated that some 3 million jobs will be killed by the Republican approach of cutting unemployment and the consequent downturn in spending by these same families.

Let's stick with those families now. They need us.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, Congress has no greater responsibility than providing for a strong national defense and keeping Americans safe. The National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation that is considered each year by the U.S. Senate. It authorizes the weapons systems, programs, and resources that support the men and women who serve our country in the Armed Forces as well as their families.

Last week, the Senate completed its work on the fiscal year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act for the 60th consecutive year. The bill received, as it should, wide bipartisan support in an 86-to-14 vote. I was proud to support the NDAA.

In my home State of Colorado, our military installations, including Fort Carson, the Air Force Academy, Buckley, Peterson, and Schriever Air Force Bases, along with Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station, are on the cutting edge of space operations, military training and readiness, and protecting our national security.

I want to thank Chairman INHOFE and the ranking member for their bipartisanship at the Senate Armed Services Committee and for doing such a great job in fulfilling their tremendous responsibility in providing for national defense. It cannot be overstated enough how grateful we all are, and I appreciate the time and work they dedicated to this effort. The security of the United States should always be more important than any partisan politics, and I appreciate their commit-

ment to placing national defense above partisan bickering. We have seen how even in the most rancorous political times Republicans and Democrats can come together through the Defense Authorization Act to renew the country's commitment to a free and open Indo-Pacific region, such as when the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act became law in December 2018.

As was stated in the U.S. Department of Defense "Indo-Pacific Strategy Report," which was released in July of last year, "This legislation [ARIA] enshrines a generational whole-of-government policy framework that demonstrates U.S. commitment to a free and open Indo-Pacific region and includes initiatives that promote sovereignty, rule of law, democracy, economic engagement, and regional security."

Now the U.S. Senate has taken the next step toward renewing the country's commitment to the Indo-Pacific region by passing this NDAA bill, enshrining and establishing a new Pacific Deterrence Initiative, PDI, that will complement ARIA and implement its vision of a more robust U.S. military presence in the Indo-Pacific. This initiative will enhance the security commitment set forth in ARIA and help guide the Congress and the Pentagon in making the tough choices necessary to prioritize the Indo-Pacific and to extend critical deterrence initiatives to check our adversaries.

Earlier this summer, Chairman INHOFE and I authored an op-ed entitled "Renewing America's Commitment to the Indo-Pacific." It described the Pacific Deterrence Initiative, which will complement the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act and implement its vision of a more robust U.S. military presence in the Indo-Pacific.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the op-ed in the Diplomat of July 2, 2020, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Diplomat, July 2, 2020]

RENEWING AMERICA'S COMMITMENT TO THE INDO-PACIFIC—A NEW PACIFIC DETERRENCE INITIATIVE WILL COMPLEMENT ARIA AND IMPLEMENT ITS VISION OF A MORE ROBUST U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE IN THE INDO-PACIFIC

(By Jim Inhofe and Cory Gardner)

As China braashly tries to impose its own system of rules and order in the Pacific, the United States and our allies in the Indo-Pacific confront a time for choosing. We must choose to advance our vision for a free and open Indo-Pacific. We must choose to ensure the success of the principles of regional and global order that remain essential to our shared security and prosperity. These are difficult choices that will come at increasingly greater cost. Beijing will do its best to make sure that the right choice and the easy choice are never the same, but we believe Americans and our allies are up to the task.

For instance, U.S. allies like Australia are already making the tough choices, while braving Beijing's bluster and bullying. By standing by its calls for an independent in-

quiry into the origins of the coronavirus and by remaining open to trade while refusing to trade away fundamental values, Australia has set a proud example for all the world. As Beijing lashes out across the region from the Himalayan Mountains to the South China Sea, Australia's actions serve as a reminder for our other allies that in a free and open Indo-Pacific, right makes might—and not the other way around.

Australia should not be alone in this effort. The United States stands with our allies, and we are prepared to make our own tough choices.

In the United States, we have seen how even in the most rancorous political times, Republicans and Democrats have joined together to renew the country's commitment to the Indo-Pacific region, like when the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act (ARIA) became law in December 2018. As was stated in the U.S. Department of Defense Indo-Pacific Strategy Report, released in July 2019: "This legislation enshrines a generational whole-of-government policy framework that demonstrates U.S. commitment to a free and open Indo-Pacific region and includes initiatives that promote sovereignty, rule of law, democracy, economic engagement, and regional security."

In the coming days, the U.S. Senate will take the next step toward renewing the country's commitment to the Indo-Pacific region by passing the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021, which establishes a new Pacific Deterrence Initiative that will complement ARIA and implement its vision of a more robust U.S. military presence in the Indo-Pacific. This initiative will enhance the security commitments set forth in ARIA, and help guide Congress and the Pentagon in making the tough choices necessary to prioritize the Indo-Pacific and extend critical deterrence initiatives to check our adversaries.

Last year, a seminal report from the United States Studies Centre (USSC) at the University of Sydney provided one of the clearest explanations of why the need for the Pacific Deterrence Initiative is both real and urgent. The report shows how China is attempting to "undercut America's military primacy" and "sowing doubt about Washington's security guarantees in the process." In the face of this development, the report describes an "increasingly worrying mismatch between America's strategy and resources," especially in the Indo-Pacific. Even as "America's military services have started to implement much needed changes," the report warns, it's not clear that America will have the "budgetary capacity or strategic focus to deliver these in a robust and timely way." We share these concerns, and the Pacific Deterrence Initiative is designed explicitly to address them.

First, the Pacific Deterrence Initiative will enhance budgetary transparency and congressional oversight by organizing our defense budget around critical Indo-Pacific priorities. The initiative will make it easier to translate regional priorities into budget priorities, and ensure that security requirements are being matched with the necessary resources.

Second, the Pacific Deterrence Initiative will focus resources on key capability gaps to give U.S. forces everything they need to compete, fight, and win in the Indo-Pacific. The initiative would focus new resources in many of the areas recommended by the USSC report, including a more distributed regional defense posture, resilient logistics networks, fuel and munitions storage, missile defenses for U.S. bases, and more experimentation to test and prove new operational concepts.

Third, consistent with ARIA provisions, the Pacific Deterrence Initiative will

prioritize cooperation with allies and partners across the Indo-Pacific. The initiative will increase security assistance for our regional allies and partners, and invest in interoperability. In the future, we expect the initiative will provide resources to support new mechanisms for deepening regional defense cooperation, including multinational fusion centers and joint training and experimentation.

Fourth, and finally, the Pacific Deterrence Initiative will help preserve peace in the Indo-Pacific by bolstering credible deterrence. The initiative will focus resources on efforts to deny our adversaries the possibility of a quick, easy, or cheap victory. By injecting uncertainty and risk into the calculations of our adversaries, we can discourage them from choosing the path of aggression.

The Pacific Deterrence Initiative is by no means a cure-all. After all, achieving credible deterrence in the Indo-Pacific region is not America's task alone. It can only be realized through a collective effort with our allies and partners such as Australia. Moreover, the challenges we face today are not limited to, or even primarily, military in character. As ARIA emphasized, we must also step up our diplomatic and economic security efforts while remaining true to our values. Nonetheless, we hope the Pacific Deterrence Initiative will serve as another demonstration to our mates in Australia, as well as our other allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific, that America's commitment to the region remains bipartisan and enduring.

Mr. GARDNER. I would also like to thank my colleagues for their bipartisan work on the Defense bill. We had a number of bipartisan amendments included and provisions that improve the use of secure facility space and make sure military communities have access to clean and safe drinking water—an incredibly important issue facing Colorado, Colorado Springs, the Fort Carson area, and others as they address the PFAS issues this Nation has dealt with.

I think it is important to remember that when one member of the family serves our country in uniform, the entire family serves, and this legislation supports military families in Colorado and truly all over the world. It provides a much needed pay increase for our military members and continues to support military spouses seeking employment.

The NDAA addresses the challenges servicemembers and their families face living in privatized housing. It expands resources to continue to address PFAS water contamination in our military communities.

In Colorado, we are proud to play a very key role in defending the United States. Our military installations are critical to national security and supporting operations in space. This year's defense authorization includes language to ensure there is transparency when it comes to selecting the final home for the headquarters—the permanent basing decision of U.S. Space Command—and that Space Command's critical mission drives the decision-making process. That is what we ensured through the Defense Authorization Act.

The bill also supports the ongoing standup of our Nation's newest mili-

tary branch, the U.S. Space Force, to include my legislation establishing the Space Force Reserve. The Space Force Reserve will mirror its sister military service branches, and as a result, the Space Force will better organize the military to handle Space Force's operations and bring all military members working in the space domain under the same organizational umbrella.

General Raymond is working hard to make sure the U.S. Space Force is agile and prepared to respond to national security threats in the space domain.

As we continue to work in establishing the U.S. Space Force, Colorado is proud to continue its support of our Nation's military operations in space. That is why in the coming weeks I will be working with my colleagues in the Senate to establish the U.S. Space Force Caucus, led by bipartisan co-leads and chairs. The caucus will provide my colleagues and their staff the opportunity to learn more about military space operations and the critical threats we face in the space domain. I welcome my colleagues' support and participation in the establishment of this caucus.

Again, I thank my colleagues, Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED, for their work on this important bill, and I am proud to support legislation that authorizes \$268 million for military construction projects in Colorado and provides a 3-percent pay raise for the men and women serving our Nation in uniform.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). The Senator from West Virginia.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, the world we are living in today is a very different one than we envisioned when we rang in the new year in the beginning of 2020 or even when we celebrated St. Patrick's Day in March. COVID has altered almost every aspect of our lives, from where we gather to celebrate or mourn to how our children are educated.

Far too many across the country have lost loved ones to this disease, or they are living with health complications because of it. However, while we are rightly focusing much of our energy on the coronavirus, this is not the only health crisis we are battling.

Unfortunately, across the Nation, drug overdose deaths are rising amidst the coronavirus, negating much of the progress we have made over the last several years. A White House Office of National Drug Control Policy analysis shows an 11.4-percent increase in fatalities for the first 4 months of 2020. My home State of West Virginia reported 923 overdose-related EMS calls in May, which is roughly a 50-percent jump from May of 2019. Our neighboring State of Kentucky—and I am sure the neighboring State of Ohio too—has estimated a 25-percent increase in overdose deaths between January and March.

Is COVID-19 directly causing these overdose deaths? No. Is the pandemic exacerbating our Nation's addiction struggle? Absolutely. It is not hard to see why. The past several months have been difficult for all of us; however, for someone in recovery, this disruption may cause them to have a hard time keeping their treatment regimens in place. The need for social distancing makes in-person recovery programs that are a lifeline for some almost impossible. Social distancing may also lead to more individuals using drugs alone, raising the risk of overdose deaths because there is no one there to help or intervene.

Last week, I had a chance to talk with CDC Director Redfield about where we are in our Nation's battle against addiction. The preliminary CDC data recently released showed drug overdose deaths climbed to a record high last year and how the addiction crisis continues to shift also, with overdose deaths rising in our other States, such as Alaska and the Dakotas. He also pointed out that deaths involving methamphetamine and cocaine have been steadily increasing despite the fact that deaths caused largely by synthetic opioids have been decreasing—or actually pills, have been decreasing. We talked about how issues like neonatal abstinence syndrome, where babies are born exposed to opioids, continue to spread.

We talked about the work we have done here in Congress and what we continue to need to do. Over the years, as I mentioned, we have seen a decline in the deaths from prescription opioids. We have seen increases in access to treatment resources. Moreover, we have seen a recognition that, as a country, we have a real addiction crisis. However, these recent statistics and the evidence we are seeing related to substance abuse during our current pandemic show us there is so much more work to do, and it has a sense of urgency to it for many of us.

This sentiment was also shared when I met with Director Carroll of the ONDCP. We met in Huntington just last Friday. Huntington is a town that is particularly hard hit by addiction. Director Carroll expressed his concern over the rising numbers of overdose deaths. He acknowledged that the public health threat posed by COVID-19 and the essential mitigation measures implemented across the country to slow the spread together have created unprecedented obstacles for Americans seeking drug treatment.

We discussed some of the responses the Trump administration has taken to the pandemic and our new reality. The Trump administration has relaxed some of the rules related to the prescribing of medication-assisted treatment. That has been helpful. The increased role of telehealth in behavioral and mental health care—that has been helpful.

The Director updated me on ONDCP's work in working to address the specific

impact drug addiction is having on rural America. Just last month, ONDCP and other Federal agencies launched the Rural Community Toolbox, which is an online clearinghouse created with the express purpose of connecting rural leaders with funding, data, and information on how to combat drug addiction. We know resources in rural America are not as plentiful as they are in other areas of the country.

We also discussed the administration's effort at the southern border to keep illegal drugs out of our communities. I am particularly interested in this area, as I chair the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, a subcommittee of Appropriations. Through this role, I was able to focus on the needs on the interdiction side so that drugs do not even physically get to West Virginia in the first place. I have been to our southern border, which is actually where most of the drugs are coming from that end up in my State. I have worked with Customs and Border Protection, the TSA, the Secret Service, and the Coast Guard to make sure they remain focused on this incredibly important aspect of our national problem.

I am also extremely proud of the work that the HSI division has done on homeland security. They have increased their presence in West Virginia and the number of officers, equipment, and partnerships, such as with Marshall University, to help supplement the work of our local law enforcement. HSI has expanded their presence at international mail facilities—something I have been a strong proponent of, and many of us in this body have as well.

Earlier this month, the Department of Homeland Security issued a 2019 seizures report to Congress. This report confirms that a majority of drugs continue to come in from our southwest border, including cocaine, fentanyl, heroin, marijuana, and methamphetamine.

Challenges as a nation and individually fill our reality today. How I wish the drug addiction epidemic did not have to continue to be one of them. Sadly, as many families across our Nation know all too well, it continues to ruin many lives. Wishing it away is not going to work. We must continue to keep our eye on the ball and provide the resources necessary to resume the progress we have begun to see.

My colleagues and I on both sides of the aisle have worked with the Senate Appropriations Committee to commit much needed resources. Chairman BLUNT has shown his dedication to the cause, both through the regular appropriations and through our stimulus bills. We continue to work to ensure that behavioral and mental health providers have the resources they need to continue to treat patients and keep their offices open. I am working with bipartisan colleagues on creative ways to address this crisis, whether by ensuring that doctors can offer non-

opioid choices as they resume elective surgeries through my NOPAIN Act with Senator JONES, or by ensuring that those in treatment and recovery can use the technologies of today to connect virtually to peers and counselors through the Prescription Digital Therapeutics to Support Recovery Act that I introduced with Senator SHAHEEN, or by arming families with the information and resources they need to help their loved ones stay in recovery during these trying times through the Family Support Services for Addiction Act that I have worked on with Senator GILLIBRAND.

Fortunately, we continue to not be alone in this fight. Despite the other demands they are currently facing, community and local organizations continue to rise to the challenge. Just last week, Shatterproof, which is a national nonprofit organization dedicated to reversing the addiction crisis in America, launched the Addiction Treatment Locator, Assessment, and Standards Platform, also known as ATLAS. ATLAS is the first resource of its kind to help those seeking addiction treatments find high-quality care and appropriate care. It was launched in six States. I am happy to say West Virginia was one of them, with the hope of expanding it to many more.

Our Nation is facing unprecedented challenges; however, I remain confident that we can meet all of them, including resuming the progress we had begun to make on our Nation's addiction crisis. I am dedicated to this, passionate about it, and look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on creative solutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I thank Senator CAPITO for not letting this body and this country forget about this terrible addiction crisis that has afflicted her State, my State, and particularly our region of the country, but well beyond that, her work has been particularly important, and I thank her for doing that.

I think it also points to the importance of our doing, during this pandemic, other things to support local governments that are so stretched with Medicaid dollars and with local public health dollars. That is the importance of the next round of pandemic funding—State and local governments, local communities, and local education.

We know that Senator MCCONNELL's effort—and I put the word "effort" in quotation marks—has fallen so short. He waited and waited and waited and waited and waited. The House passed its bill in May. This body, through Senator MCCONNELL, would not even take it up until—would not even begin negotiations, really, until this week, when unemployment is about to expire and when the eviction moratorium is about to expire. If the opioid crisis, public health crisis, is bad now and we haven't dealt with the coronavirus,

well, now imagine what will happen when people lose their unemployment or when it is reduced to \$200 a week, causing mass eviction. Moratoria are expiring, and eviction courts are opening up all over the country. Imagine what will happen with the opioid addiction public health disaster and imagine what will happen with coronavirus if people lose their apartments in large numbers.

I just don't think any of us can quite imagine that tragedy. It is clear that my colleagues on this side of the aisle don't get out very much, don't talk to people very much, and don't listen to people very much and see what these huge needs are for people to continue some semblance of the standard of living they had prior to the coronavirus.

NOMINATION OF DANA T. WADE

Madam President, I rise to oppose the nomination of Dana Wade to serve as the Federal Housing Commissioner and Assistant Secretary for Housing.

Mrs. Wade has a long record of public service—I credit her for that—both in the Senate and this administration. She worked at HUD and as staff to the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. However, the policies that Mrs. Wade has supported during her work in the Trump administration led me to believe she is not the right person to lead HUD's housing and home ownership programs at this critical time.

Just last year, Mrs. Wade held a senior political role at the Office of Management and Budget. During her tenure at OMB, Mrs. Wade signed off on budget proposals that would have slashed HUD's funding by billions, eliminated CDBG and HOME programs—programs critical to affordable housing and community development—and raised rents on the lowest income renters. She also signed off on rules that could displace more than 55,000 children from their homes. I don't think that is the person we want during the pandemic, when all the moratoria on evictions expire, when the majority party wants to cut \$400 a week from unemployed workers—these are unemployed workers—and when eviction courts are open. I just question whether Mrs. Wade, even in this administration, is the right person to temper some of their actions that might end up with more people denied housing.

She signed off on a rule that denied transgender individuals experiencing homelessness the right to seek shelter according to their gender identity. She signed off on a rule that cut HUD's affirmatively furthering fair housing regulation—an important civil rights protection required by the Fair Housing Act, an act written and pushed and initially implemented by the father of the Senator from Utah. I know he is really proud of his dad, and I know he is really proud of HUD's fair housing laws of the late 1960s.

On Mrs. Wade's watch, HUD and OMB proposed to allow communities to ignore and exacerbate segregation even

as they spend Federal funds. That is not the only civil rights rollback that Mrs. Wade oversaw. During her tenure, OMB signed off on HUD's proposal to undermine the disparate impact standard under the Fair Housing Act—a proposal that the civil rights community, the largest mortgage lenders, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the National Association of Realtors have all said should not be finalized because it could erode civil rights protections. All the groups that deal with housing: the conservative groups, the progressive groups, the civil rights groups, the firms that make their living from housing, the realtors, the mortgage bankers—all of them said: Don't move forward with this. She signed off on it with HUD's proposal.

When I asked Mrs. Wade about her time at OMB, she wouldn't speak about the work she did, but she endorsed every one of these policies the Trump administration advanced during her tenure.

Since Mrs. Wade returned to HUD in December, the Trump administration has doubled down on its assault on fair housing.

Just last week, the Trump administration released its final rule, all but eliminating communities' legal obligation to affirmatively further fair housing. And now President Trump wants Mrs. Wade to oversee FHA and critical housing programs for low-income families, for seniors, and for persons with disabilities.

HUD and FHA have an essential role to play in our housing system during this pandemic. FHA is designed to play a countercyclical role, stepping in to keep the market working during economic downturns like the one we are in.

In the weeks and months ahead, families will need access to sustainable mortgages, and renters will need access to safe affordable apartments. Homeowners who are struggling to make their payments will need forbearance and help getting back on track. At the end of forbearance, if we want to avoid a wave of foreclosures—we know what is happening with evictions about to happen in a much more concerted tidal wave sort of way if Senate Republicans get their way by shrinking, by cutting \$400 per unemployed worker—\$400 a week—and the moratorium on evictions expiring and the eviction courts open. We know what will happen there. We are also, of course, concerned about the subsequent or, at the same time, wave of foreclosures. We need FHA to keep up its important work. They can do more. They must do more.

Over the past several months, following the murder of George Floyd at the hands of police and with racial and ethnic health and economic disparities exacerbated by COVID-19, our country has finally begun to talk about the systemic racism that exists throughout every system, including housing. It is the justice system. It is education. We know more and more about the huge

digital divide. It is the justice system. It is education. It is healthcare.

We know that African-Americans' life expectancies are considerably shorter than White Americans. We know the infant mortality rate and maternal mortality rate are considerably higher. We know all of those things. The American public is finally recognizing them. This is an opportunity. With housing, it was Jim Crow; then it was redlining; and now it is these rules that the Trump administration is lacking in. Conversely to what Mrs. Wade has advocated for, argued for, and done, HUD and FHA must be a part of addressing that systemic racism now and after this pandemic. FHA could start by helping Black and Brown families stay in their homes so we don't repeat the mistakes of the 2008 crisis, where Black borrowers and Brown borrowers were more likely to lose their homes to foreclosure.

At the end of this pandemic, FHA and HUD's rental programs can also help families recover financially and access affordable homeownership, maybe for the first time, but it will take a commitment from FHA and a commitment from HUD to address the massive inequity that still exists.

This President, we know, actively undermines fairness in our housing system. We saw it again last week when he boasted that he would maintain segregation in our communities. It is a political act, of course. Just like sending Federal troops into Portland is a political act, just like his purporting to stand up to China, which he hasn't done for 4 years, is a political act, but we see it now as he divides people in the suburbs. Unfortunately, rather than working to fulfill the promise of the Fair Housing Act, HUD is aiding the President's effort.

Based on Mrs. Wade's recent work and the policies she has helped to advance, I am concerned she will not stand up to the President's efforts to turn back the clock on fair housing. She will, instead, in all likelihood, help this administration take our housing system in the wrong direction. That is why I oppose her nomination.

I hope, if she is confirmed, she proves me wrong.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby

move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David Cleveland Joseph, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Michael B. Enzi, Tim Scott, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, James E. Risch, David Perdue, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Lindsey Graham, Thom Tillis, Deb Fischer, Mike Crapo, Kevin Cramer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of David Cleveland Joseph, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 143 Ex.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—42

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

NOT VOTING—3

Leahy	Markey	Sanders
-------	--------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Dana T. Wade, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Mike Crapo, Marco Rubio, Lindsey Graham, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, Michael B. Enzi, Marsha Blackburn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Dana T. Wade, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 144 Ex.]

YEAS—57

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

NAYS—40

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

NOT VOTING—3

Leahy	Markey	Sanders
-------	--------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 40.

The motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

HONORING AND COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN LEWIS

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, throughout all of human history, in every generation, there are a handful of people who rise to the level of greatness. Despite adversity, danger, and sometimes impossible odds, these great men and women fight for what is right and push our society forward and make America better for the next generation. That has been true for the last 230 years.

Representative John Lewis in our generation, who just passed away last week, was certainly the embodiment of this type of greatness. John was a titan in the struggle for civil rights and the equality of all races. Because of him, more Americans can enjoy their God-given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

John's lifelong fight against injustice began at a very young age, as we now know. When his local library banned African Americans from checking out books, a teenaged John Lewis wrote a petition requesting and demanding equal access.

From that point forward, John Lewis never backed down from the fight for what is right. He always remained peaceful, despite receiving physical violence and going to jail for his protests.

His commitment to nonviolence served as a guiding force in John's life. He founded the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee to fight for non-violent resistance across America.

In 1961, he participated in the Freedom Rides to protest segregation in public transportation.

John's determination for equal rights only grew stronger and more effective over time. At age 23, he was one of the "Big Six" leaders of the March on Washington where Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., shared his dream for a better future for everyone.

Later, John bravely marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL, where he was beaten in what was called Bloody Sunday.

The efforts of John Lewis and others finally paid off with the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That bill gave African Americans the right to fully participate in our democratic Republic. It pushed our country forward.

That incredible victory may seem like the end of John's struggle for equal rights. In reality, it was just the beginning. For the rest of his life, John

Lewis never lost sight of what the real fight involved.

During his time in the Atlanta City Council and later in Congress, he never gave up the fight for justice.

Today, our country is mourning a hero, a truly great American, and a great Georgian.

As we continue to say our good-byes, we should also take this time to reflect on John Lewis's life and what he stood for. We should take this as a call to action to continue the effort to which he dedicated his life.

The stain of injustice still marks our country. Just this year, there have been horrible tragedies that have shaken all of us to our core. Though John Lewis is no longer with us, we can still carry on his legacy.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 660, submitted earlier today, and that the text be read in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will read the resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 660

Whereas the Senate mourns the loss of John Lewis, a titan in the struggle for civil rights and equality for all races, and commemorates his life and accomplishments;

Whereas John Lewis was born during the era of Jim Crow in a segregated community in which racism and discrimination ran rampant;

Whereas John Lewis's moral clarity and unwavering commitment to nonviolence made his first passions preaching and ministry;

Whereas John Lewis fought his first battle against segregation when he was just a teenager, authoring a petition for equal access to his local public library, where African Americans had paid for the construction of the facilities but were banned from checking out books;

Whereas, before his 21st birthday, John Lewis established his commitment to "good trouble" by organizing sit-ins at segregated restaurants and theaters;

Whereas John Lewis helped found the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which advocated for civil disobedience and nonviolent resistance against segregation across the United States, bringing him to the forefront of the struggle of the United States for civil rights;

Whereas John Lewis participated in the 1961 Freedom Rides, which were a series of trips that tested a new desegregation order of interstate transportation facilities and resulted in multiple beatings and the firebombing of the bus that John Lewis was supposed to be riding;

Whereas, at 23 years of age, John Lewis served as the youngest member of the "Big Six", which planned the 1963 March on Washington, and worked alongside Martin Luther King, Jr., James Farmer, A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, and Whitney Young to advocate for racial equality and justice for all;

Whereas John Lewis courageously led protestors across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, bravely bearing violence from the police to embody the struggle of the United States to live up to its founding ideals of equal justice under the law;

Whereas the bravery of John Lewis during "Bloody Sunday" led Congress to pass, and President Lyndon B. Johnson to sign into law, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), ensuring that African Americans have the right to fully participate in the democratic process in the United States;

Whereas John Lewis faithfully served the city of Atlanta between 1977 and 1981, embodying his election night promise to "bring a sense of ethics and moral courage" to the Atlanta City Council;

Whereas John Lewis faithfully served the 5th congressional district of Georgia in the House of Representatives between 1987 and 2020, serving as the "conscience of the Congress" by continuing his pursuit of justice and truth in the capital of the United States; and

Whereas the Senate commends John Lewis for his life and for embodying the spirit of love and dignity through his unceasing advocacy for reconciliation, justice, and the equality of all mankind: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable John Lewis, a late Member of the House of Representatives; and

(B) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate—

(i) communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives; and

(ii) transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of John Lewis; and

(2) when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable John Lewis.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 660) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Kan nomination at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Kan nomination, the postcloture time expire at 2:45 p.m. tomorrow; further, that the cloture motion with respect to the Kaplan nomination ripen following disposition of the Kan nomination and, if cloture is invoked on the Kaplan nomination, the postcloture time expire at 4:45 p.m. tomorrow. I further ask that if either of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the McFerran

nomination ripen at 11:30 a.m., Thursday, July 30; and that if cloture is invoked on the McFerran nomination, the postcloture time expire at 1:30 p.m. Thursday; and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON JOSEPH NOMINATION

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the rollcall votes scheduled for 2:30 p.m. today begin now.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Joseph nomination.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 145 Ex.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—42

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

NOT VOTING—3

Leahy	Markey	Sanders
-------	--------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dana T. Wade, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Wade nomination?

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 146 Ex.]

YEAS—57

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

NAYS—40

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

NOT VOTING—3

Leahy	Markey	Sanders
-------	--------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam 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.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today as the Senate works on the next phase of pandemic relief and recovery legislation. The country is united in combating the coronavirus.

The Senate's top priority is protecting the American people, and we are working together to save lives.

America is fighting a war—a war against a deadly disease. There is no retreating, no giving up the American fighting spirit. We will finish the fight.

The key to victory is to control the virus spread until we have a vaccine. A successful vaccine is vital to beat the virus and to return to normal life. The race for a COVID-19 vaccine is as important as putting a man on the Moon. We have made incredible progress. Vaccine development is well ahead of schedule. The administration's public-private partnership, Operation Warp Speed, has started phase 2 and phase 3 vaccine trials much sooner than expected. These are human trials. If all goes well, we hope to have a vaccine ready by the end of this year.

Senate Republicans will make sure Americans have a safe, effective vaccine as soon as possible. It will be the most accessible vaccine in the history of the United States. Meanwhile, we should all do our part to slow the spread, and we know what that means. That means socially distancing, using good hygiene, and wearing a mask.

This is the time for all of us to come together. But instead of fighting the virus, Democrats are waging a never-ending bidding war for more government spending. People want and people need and people deserve real leadership. They expect us to slow the spread of the virus and to protect the vulnerable.

We have made tremendous progress on testing. We have tested over 50 million people already, and we are close to conducting 1 million tests—1 million tests—every day. We also have better treatments for the disease, and we are taking care of our most vulnerable citizens—seniors and people with chronic medical conditions.

At the same time, the economy is bouncing back. We had record job growth in May, as well as in June. That is because the Senate responded quickly to the health and economic crisis. The Senate's historic CARES Act rescue package has helped this country weather the storm. We have come far

since the spring lockdowns. Still, some believe that the worst of the virus may be yet to come.

The Senate has put together a commonsense plan to aid the recovery. This week, Senate Republicans introduced a framework bill for the next coronavirus relief legislation. It is the capstone to our pandemic rescue operation. Our plan focuses on getting people back to work and kids back to school and doing it safely, as well as, of course, defeating the disease. The Senate proposal provides even more resources for testing and healthcare. This means more for hospitals, more for treatment, and more for vaccines.

Our package includes over \$100 billion for schools to open safely, plus funding for childcare. The Senate plan provides liability protection. We shield the medical community, K-12 schools, colleges, universities, and small businesses from frivolous lawsuits. Our plan includes another round of PPP loans, helping the hardest hit small businesses. We also send a targeted second round of direct payments to individuals. The Senate package extends unemployment benefits in a way that encourages, not discourages, work. We cannot continue to pay people more to stay home than they would make at work. So we end the \$600 weekly benefit bonus. That is in contrast to NANCY PELOSI's \$3 trillion-and-growing bill, her so-called Heroes Act. Her package actually makes it easier for the economy to stay closed and much harder for the economy to reopen fully.

The Senate is focused on healthcare, on kids, and on jobs. Democrats, it seems, have other priorities—endless bonus checks for staying home, bloated bailouts for mismanaged cities and States, and runaway spending unrelated to the challenge before us.

Pre-pandemic, we had a booming economy. We had record job growth, and we had record low unemployment. We are working to restore Americans' confidence. A solid majority of Americans now say they see their finances as stable.

I urge my Senate Democratic colleagues to come to the table. It is time to find common ground and to finish the fight.

Together, Madam President, we will make sure that America wins the war.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTHCARE WORKFORCE
RESILIENCE ACT

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, the word "bipartisanship" gets tossed around a lot in this town. Unfortu-

nately, we don't often see bipartisan-ship put into action. However, as we have faced an unprecedented crisis recently, I believe we have seen the Senate prove that it can, in fact, get it done. People can come together, and real, bipartisan solutions can actually happen in this body.

It is actually encouraging to me—and it is simply a function of what I have known since I was a kid—that Americans deal with a crisis better than anyone else. In many ways, we put things aside, and we get together for what is good for the people back home.

Since the COVID-19 crisis began, we have passed three phases of relief packages to help our country weather this COVID-19 storm. In these three phases, we ramped up testing in support of our healthcare workers, we helped Americans who are struggling financially, and we created the Paycheck Protection Program, which has saved millions of jobs and many businesses. Today, as we debate a fourth COVID-19 relief package, it is absolutely critical that we continue to find common ground and bipartisan solutions to bring our country together again.

The Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act is a real, bipartisan solution to a serious problem our country faces today in our healthcare delivery system. This bill is first and foremost a healthcare bill that will help our hospitals deal with this COVID-19 crisis. It is absolutely critical that we include it in the next COVID-19 relief package.

Today in America, many communities are facing severe shortages of doctors and nurses. Particularly, hospitals and clinics in rural areas and communities of color are badly understaffed and are struggling to fill crucial positions.

My home State of Georgia has been especially impacted by this particular crisis. While Georgia is the 8th largest State by population, it ranks 39th in the number of active physicians per capita—39th. Over half of Georgia's 159 counties have been designated as primary care health professional shortage areas. The Georgia Department of Public Health has stated that Georgia's nursing shortage is a full-blown crisis. This is also true in most other States, actually. They have warned that Georgia is not able to recruit the nurses or doctors our hospitals need. But we can change that.

The COVID-19 crisis did not start this shortage of healthcare workers, by the way, but it has exacerbated it dramatically.

Since the beginning of this crisis, I have held conference calls with thousands of constituents across Georgia over the last 4½ months. I have heard directly from healthcare workers who have explained the dire situation they are facing. Nurses and doctors are working longer hours. Retirees are being asked to come back to work. Many healthcare workers have contracted the virus themselves. In fact,

one study found that healthcare workers account for nearly one in five COVID-19 cases.

In many areas, hospitals have simply not had enough staff to handle the COVID-19 patient increase. Albany, GA, was one of the first hardest hit areas in the country, right there in South Georgia. At one point, nurses and doctors from all over the country had to be flown in just to take care of all those who fell ill in Albany. In many cases, patients had to be exported to other hospitals in the State.

As this virus continues to spread, many hospitals are in danger of being overwhelmed as we see this recent surge of COVID-19 cases, particularly in our younger people.

Healthcare workers have been true heroes—there is no question about that. Right now, we have an opportunity to give them the support they desperately need. The Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act is a bipartisan solution that gives our hospitals the support they need to get through this crisis. Our bill simply recaptures unused green cards to give highly skilled, foreign-born nurses and doctors the opportunity to work in our country and help solve this crisis. It will recapture approximately 25,000 unused visas for nurses and 15,000 unused visas for doctors. This bill would cut redtape and give our hospitals critical support quickly as America continues to reopen our economy. It will ease the pressure on healthcare providers and help save American lives.

I want to emphasize that this bill will not increase current legal immigration limits, displace American workers, or negatively impact healthcare worker wages.

I have always been a supporter of a merit-based immigration system, and many people on the other side of the aisle are as well. We all continue to work in that direction. We believe that a merit-based immigration system can strengthen our economy and protect American jobs at the same time. This is a policy that President Trump and the majority of Congress have long supported—on both sides of the aisle, actually. The Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act is fully aligned with these merit-based policies.

These immigrant nurses and doctors have already been hired and approved to work in our country. Many of them live here already. The only thing preventing them from saving lives is bureaucratic redtape and the backlog it creates. These folks are highly skilled, well qualified, and extremely motivated to be on the frontlines in the fight against COVID-19. They are all ready to go in the areas that need the most help.

This bill is truly bipartisan. I am very proud to say that today. It has 36 cosponsors from both parties. I give the lead sponsor on the Democratic side, my friend from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, a lot of credit for that. He has long been a champion for this sort of help in

this area. This bill reflects what the American people want. It provides what our healthcare system needs. It has bipartisan support.

Actually, in 2005, Congress passed a similar bill. That bill recaptured unused visas and helped address a nursing shortage that existed at the time across the country. It passed with overwhelming and nearly unanimous support. The coronavirus has put our country in a similar position today. There is no time to wait. The deeper our nurse and doctor shortage gets, the more Americans we are needlessly putting at risk.

President John F. Kennedy once said: “In a time of domestic crisis, men of goodwill and generosity should be able to unite regardless of party or politics.” I don’t think that comment has been any more timely than it is today in the midst of this crisis.

We are indeed in a time of crisis. We have already shown that we can unite and find meaningful solutions. It is time to do it again. Let’s get this bill across the finish line and support our healthcare workers and save lives in America.

Madam President, I yield the floor to my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, the lead Democratic cosponsor on the Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act, and I want to thank him for his tireless efforts in this regard and his strong leadership to help the young men and women on the frontlines of our healthcare delivery system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me thank my colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Georgia, for joining me in this bipartisan effort. We now have some 36 sponsors and cosponsors of this legislation.

Immigration can be a divisive issue, but this is an immigration measure that is not divisive. It has unified us on a bipartisan basis, as it should. We are talking about the Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act. We are talking about men and women who, as we speak on the floor of the Senate in the safety of this Chamber, are literally risking their lives as healthcare professionals across the United States to deal with this pandemic, which we fight every single day.

Last week, we sent a bipartisan letter urging congressional leaders to make this bill part of any COVID-19 relief legislation. Currently pending before the Senate is a negotiation with the White House, the House, the Senate—Democrats and Republicans—to make sure that we continue to move forward to fight this pandemic and to restore the vibrancy of our own economy. The letter we sent was cosigned by Senators LEAHY, YOUNG, and COONS, as well as Representatives SCHNEIDER, COLE, FINKENAUER, and BACON, who were the lead sponsors of the House version of the same bill. We are now up to, I understand, 37. They said 36 earlier. I am told we have 18 Republicans

and 19 Democrats, and the window is open for those who want to join us in this bipartisan effort. They will not regret it.

Our bill is a temporary stopgap measure, but it is designed to strengthen our healthcare workforce and improve healthcare access for Americans in the midst of this crisis. Consider this reality when it comes to fighting the COVID-19 virus: In the United States, 1 in 6 healthcare and social workers, 3.1 million—1 in 6—of the 18.7 million are immigrants. Yet our broken immigration laws prevent many of these immigrants from contributing more fully to the battle against this pandemic.

Under current law, there are not enough immigrant visas, which we also call green cards, available each year. As a result, immigrants are stuck in crippling backlogs for many, many years. The green card backlog, which I have debated with Senator LEE on the floor many times—but this green card backlog includes thousands of medical doctors currently working in our country on temporary visas. This backlog puts them and their families at the risk of losing their immigration status and being deported. It hinders their ability to fight against COVID-19 because these doctors face many restrictions due to their temporary status.

For example, many of these doctors cannot take shifts at hospitals in COVID-19 hotspots where they are desperately needed. The Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act, which we bring to the floor, would reallocate 25,000 unused immigrant visas for nurses and 15,000 unused immigrant visas for doctors. These are visas Congress has previously authorized but were never used.

It is important to note that our bill requires employers to attest that immigrants overseas who receive these visas do not displace the employment of any American workers. We want to ensure that the beneficiaries of this bill complement, not replace, the American healthcare workforce.

I am going to tell you the story of one of these doctors who is practicing in downstate Illinois in the Quad Cities area in Moline. I can tell you, as a downstater myself, there are many areas of downstate that are rural, small town, and cannot bring in the specialists who are needed. That is why these doctors become so important when they step in and provide their services. Let me tell you about this doctor.

His name is Dr. Bhanu Vakkalanka. He sent me a letter and told me his story, and he asked me to help work to pass this piece of legislation. Dr. Vakkalanka and his wife, Dr. Sasi Royyuru—excuse me for mispronouncing—Royyuru—are both physicians. They met in medical school in India, and they came to the United States 15 years ago in 2005—15 years ago. At the time, their children—a young girl and boy—were 5 and 3 years old.

Before they came to the United States, they had trained and worked

for 10 years in England. Both achieved great professional success, but they were drawn to move to the United States. They were drawn to our freedom, our equality, and the opportunity that really is our trademark in the world.

This is what Dr. Vakkalanka told me about his family's move to the United States, and I want to quote his words:

It was not an easy transition. We had to start all over again as residents. It was challenging to take care of two young children in the middle of our long working hours and paltry salaries with no one to fall back on. . . . But we had not come this far to give up on our dreams easily.

Dr. Vakkalanka now works as a medical oncologist for the UnityPoint Health System in Moline, in my home State of Illinois, a well-respected institution. Dr. Royyuru is a family physician in Bloomington, IL. There is a long drive between the two, Moline and Bloomington. Here is what Dr. Vakkalanka told me about his life in America:

Despite the initial hardship, we fell in love with the United States soon after we came here. People were welcoming and generous. We were made to feel like we were part of this society from day one and we felt that this is where we belonged. We felt blessed, happy and proud to be able to live here, raise our children and call it our home.

Let me tell you, he tells me how fortunate he was. I believe we are the fortunate ones—fortunate to have two exceptional physicians and their children as residents of my home State.

Unfortunately, Dr. Vakkalanka and Dr. Royyuru, his wife, are two of thousands of doctors who are stuck in a bureaucratic backlog called the green card backlog. They have lived in the United States for 15 years. Their green card petitions were approved nearly a decade ago. Yet, even today, after more than 10 years, they are not lawful residents. Why? Because the backlog of people seeking these green cards—these immigration visas—is so large.

In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, the temporary immigration status of this family puts them at real risk. Why? If, God forbid, they would contract COVID-19 and become disabled or die, their family will instantly lose their immigration status and be forced to leave the United States. For 15 years they have waited, and for 10 years they have been on the actual queue, the waiting list for green cards, and if one of them takes ill and cannot work, they could all be deported.

Now their children, who were 5 and 3 when they arrived in the United States, are 20 years old and 18 years old. This is significant. They grew up in this country, but they are at risk of aging out in this bureaucratic system. If they reach the age of 21, these two children, who have lived here virtually all of their teenage and adolescent life—if they reach the age of 21 and have not been able to apply for a green card, they are subject to deportation. Can you imagine how devastating it would be for this doctor and his wife to

think that their children, after all these years, would be deported from the United States? It is a very real risk.

Dr. Vakkalanka told me:

Our children waited for 15 years or longer along with us for their turn. They laughed with us and cried with us for all these years. It is not fair to kick them out of the line for no fault of theirs. They have nowhere else to go. This country is their only home!

Dr. Vakkalanka and Dr. Royyuru's family story makes clear why Congress needs to include the Healthcare Workforce Resilience Act in the next coronavirus relief legislation. Under our bill, these two good doctors from India, and thousands of others like them, would finally receive their green cards. They and their families would get the permanent immigration status they deserve and be able to use their skills to serve on the frontlines of the pandemic wherever they are needed most.

Let's face it. This pandemic is testing us as a nation, testing us as to whether we will have the endurance and the determination to get through this pandemic but equally testing us as to whether we care for one another. Certainly, we care for our families. We spend a lot of time with them. We worry about not being able to be next to our children or grandchildren because of fear of infection, and it is a real test. But it is also a test of our values of who we are.

This man, after giving 15 years to the United States, practicing medicine in areas where he is desperately needed, is simply asking for a chance to become a legal, permanent resident of the United States. It is not too much to ask. For all he has given us, and his wife as well, we owe it to him and his family to give them the peace of mind that they have a future in the United States. They have proved that they are deserving.

I hope, even in these divided political times, we can come together in Congress to quickly aid these immigrant health heroes.

I commend my colleague from Georgia. I thank him. He had to step away from the floor at this moment, but I thank him for joining me in this bipartisan effort.

Let's get this done. Let do the right thing for this doctor, for his family, and for so many others.

RACISM

Mr. President, the great writer, James Baldwin, told us:

Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced.

The national discussion on race and racism in the wake of the death of George Floyd in Minneapolis has really opened the eyes of many Americans and people around the world. Many people are seeing more clearly—some perhaps for the first time in their lives—the extent to which injustice has embedded itself in parts of America.

We see how some of our laws and institutions don't match our stated and

professed belief that all men and women are created equal and endowed with the same inalienable rights.

Later today, John Lewis will make his last departure from the U.S. Capitol. He is going home after a long and noble life of service, a life that has helped us to live up to our ideals. How often did we hear John Lewis say: When young people tell me that nothing has changed, I tell them to come walk in my shoes.

He was so right. America is different and America is better because of the enormous sacrifice and courage of men like John Lewis, Reverend C.T. Vivian, who passed away, as well, last week; Joseph Lowery; Mamie Till; Martin Luther King; Coretta Scott King; Rosa Parks; Daisy Bates; Julian Bond; Bayard Rustin; Elijah Cummings; and, of course, my friend and the current House Democratic Whip, JAMES CLYBURN, and so many other leaders of our modern civil rights movement—just too many to name.

We are a more perfect union today because so many ordinary men and women and children whose names are mostly forgotten by history risked their lives for dignity and democracy in little towns like Selma and Birmingham, AL, and Chicago's Marquette Park neighborhood.

Thank goodness we are better, but the work of true justice and equality is far from over. We know that. A month before he died, John Lewis spoke out about how he was moved to see so many people from different backgrounds marching together for racial justice and healing. Most Americans today are appalled—almost incredulous—that only decades ago young people like John Lewis and Diane Nash were accosted by angry mobs simply for having the audacity—the audacity—to sit at a Whites-only lunch counter or ride on a segregated bus.

We reject racism as individuals, but many of us are only beginning to understand the existence of the corrosive consequences of the system of racial injustice. This national reckoning on race in which we are now engaged is helping us to see more clearly how old, discredited ideas about race, which have been rejected by most, still linger in the minds of many individuals, regardless of the laws that have been passed.

I believe that most Americans believe very deeply in fairness. It is one of our defining values as a people. I also believe Maya Angelou was right when she said:

Do the best you can until you know better. Then when you know better, do better.

How can we do better to reduce systemic racial injustice and heal the wounds and divisions that false notions of racial superiority have caused in our Nation and our fellow citizens? As John Lewis told us often, achieving great, genuine equality is the work of a lifetime. Let me suggest briefly a few ways that this Senate can begin that work.

First—and this is so easy and obvious—let the Senate debate and vote on the Justice in Policing Act. The President can send unidentified Federal agents to as many cities as he likes, but the calls for justice in our streets will not end until we make a clear stand against policing tactics that killed George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Tamir Rice, Laquan McDonald, and too many other men, women, and children of color in America.

Our Republican colleagues acknowledged the need for policing reforms when they brought up the bill that included certain changes, but the bill did not proceed, and it should. This Senate can—and must—do better. This belief is shared by an overwhelming majority of civil rights organizations in our Nation.

The Justice in Policing Act is sponsored by Senators KAMALA HARRIS and CORY BOOKER. It has passed the House of Representatives, and I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The House, in passing its version with a bipartisan vote, gave us an opportunity, I say to Senator McCONNELL, to debate the Justice in Policing Act, which passed the House, and here in the Senate we should.

Second, let this Senate debate the Economic Justice Act that has been offered by Senator SCHUMER.

Third, Martin Luther King called racial disparities in healthcare one of the most shocking of all racial injustices. It was more than 50 years ago when he said. Yet the disparities persist to this day and may be worse in many ways.

This pandemic has laid them bare for us to see. Black and Brown Americans are three times more likely to become infected with coronavirus than White Americans and twice as likely to die from COVID-19.

The Affordable Care Act has done more to reduce racial disparities in healthcare than almost any act since the creation of Medicaid. It is hard to believe that there are many on the other side still trying to kill the Affordable Care Act in the midst of a pandemic that has already taken the lives of 145,000 Americans. Many more have been sickened, and it is still burning out of control in large parts of our Nation. Think about what it would be if we had no Affordable Care Act and doubled the number of uninsured people in this country. How could that bring us any consolation or confidence that we can continue to fight this battle?

For the sake of African Americans, Latinx Americans, and all Americans who rely on the affordable coverage and patient protections, it is time to put an end to this endless assault on the Affordable Care Act.

I hope my colleagues—especially my colleagues who speak passionately about protecting mothers and babies—will join me in passing a bill I have introduced to reduce the shocking high rate of maternal and infant mortality among African-American women and their babies. It is inexplicable that in

the United States of America, we see so many Black women dying in childbirth and so many babies dying as well. It is unnecessary. It is time for us to focus the great resources, health resources, of America on this issue.

In America, a woman of color is three to four times more likely than a White woman to die as a result of pregnancy. Why? The answers are very obvious. We need better, more focused, more understanding medical care. I am sad to say that in Illinois, the situation—the numbers—are that bad, if not even worse.

The United States is 1 of only 13 nations in the world in which the maternal mortality rate is worse than it was 25 years ago. In the United States of America, we are 1 of only 13 nations in which the maternal death rate is worse today than what it was 25 years ago. How in the world can we explain that?

I have introduced a bill called the MOMMA Act. My companion in this effort is my Congresswoman from Chicago, ROBIN KELLY. Let's get that debated, I say to Senator McCONNELL. It will not take long. I bet it passes easily. We owe it to many across America to show the initiative and to bring it to the floor.

Fourth, because our friends across the aisle could not agree among themselves on what would be in the next coronavirus relief bill, critical protections included in the CARES Act have now or will soon expire without replacement.

These protections include payments for the jobless for tens of millions of Americans who have lost their jobs in this pandemic—it wasn't because they were lazy; it was bad luck—as well as the Federal moratorium on evictions for families who have had difficulty paying their rent because of economic devastation brought on by COVID-19.

Unless we extend this moratorium, as many as 28 million could lose their homes in the next 3 months. I can't imagine the devastation that would bring to a family—losing your home and perhaps having no place to turn. For the sake of those families and for our ability to fight this virus, we must extend the moratorium on evictions and help families who are struggling to pay rent.

Senator WARREN introduced a bill that I have cosponsored to extend this critical moratorium through March. It is called the Protecting Renters from Evictions and Fees Act.

I am proud to cosponsor a bill with Senator BROWN that provides \$100 billion in emergency rental assistance to help families and individuals pay their rent. Let's keep these families in a safe, quality living environment.

The crisis of affordable housing didn't start with this pandemic. The shortage of safe, affordable public housing has been building for decades, and it disproportionately harms African-American families.

Senator HARRIS of California has introduced a bill, which I am proud to co-

sponsor, called the Housing Infrastructure Act. It would invest \$100 billion to repair our current stock of public housing and to build new units of safe, affordable public housing.

I could just walk you through a map of the State of Illinois and the public housing I have visited and witnessed that is in desperate need of repair. It is time, you think, to call the landlord and say: What are you going to do about this housing unit that you own that is falling down? Except, it turns out, we are the landlords. The Federal Government owns this property. The Federal Government has the responsibility to fix it.

Last week, President Trump moved to repeal an Obama-era rule meant to ban discriminatory housing and zoning laws and policies. It is not pricing from this President, but it is wrong. We need to move forward and not backward. The housing infrastructure needs to move in the right direction.

Finally, once again, in the name of John Lewis, I believe that the right to vote was “almost sacred,” in his words, and I share that feeling, but that right is now threatened by a series of misguided decisions in recent years by the Supreme Court and other courts.

The House passed a bill last year to restore the Voting Rights Act to its original intent. That bill is being reintroduced in the Senate this week by Senator LEAHY and in the House by Congressman CLYBURN. The difference? They are naming it in honor of Congressman John Lewis.

John Lewis did not risk his life in Selma and so many other places so people would praise him in speeches or name things after him. He did not risk his life for the right to have a bridge named after him—although it is a fitting tribute. He risked his life over and over again to protect the right of every American to vote.

Americans' faith in our electoral system—the cornerstone of our democracy—continues to be under attack by entities that wish us ill.

For those who gathered in the Rotunda yesterday to honor his memory and to stand in silent respect for all the work of his life, I say to my fellow Senators who were there: Let us pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act in the name of Congressman John Lewis. Let us make it clear that his life was worth this and so much more.

When you know better, you do better. Our eyes have been opened, and now it is time for us to act.

It is my honor to serve in this Senate, but I am sorry to say that when it comes to production of important, meaningful legislation, this institution has fallen far behind.

We seldom take up bills of great importance and magnitude. We just passed the Defense authorization bill—a very important piece of legislation, which I believe has passed for 59 straight years in Congress, and I am glad it passed again, but now you see an empty floor and an empty Chamber

where we are not taking up the issues that we should.

There is one person who controls the agenda and the schedule of this Chamber, and that is the Republican majority leader, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky. Let's not waste this opportunity to make America a better place. Let's do things that make a difference.

America is counting on us in the midst of this massive health crisis with COVID-19—perhaps the worst health crisis our Nation has faced in over 100 years. With the state of our economy and so many—tens of millions of people out of work, shouldn't we be acting together on a bipartisan basis, as we did in March of this year, to pass legislation?

The reports we have is that the other side of the aisle is in disarray. I might remind Senator MCCONNELL that the best legislation that passes here is bipartisan. And this measure, COVID relief, moving forward, should be bipartisan as well. For it to be bipartisan, we need people of both parties to sit down together and negotiate. That has to continue, along with the participation of the White House, in order to achieve these goals.

First and foremost, we need to restore unemployment assistance to the millions of families who will see it end in just a few days. I cannot imagine having lost your job, worried about whether there is another one waiting or whether one will be available, and then having to worry about whether you can make that rent payment, the mortgage payment, the utility bills, food, health insurance—the basics—and to be told that Congress just let unemployment assistance expire, which happens in just 3 days. What are these families going to do?

I sincerely hope that every Member of the Senate will reach out to one of these unemployed families and listen quietly to their stories. I have seen them as they come to the food pantries. I have seen them come and ask for help, which they never dreamed they would have to do. It must be heartbreaking to go through that experience. Let's stand by them now. They need us now more than ever.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The clerk will call the roll. The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday, I was privileged to be able to pay my respects to Representative John Lewis as he lay in state in the Capitol Rotunda—a fitting place for an American hero.

His death is a loss, but his dauntless courage and deep conviction have carved out for him a permanent place in American history. When we tell stories of those who have made America greater, John Lewis's name will always be among them.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday, Senate Republicans introduced the next phase of our coronavirus relief effort, the Health, Economic Assistance, Liability Protection, and Schools Act, or the HEALS Act.

This bill has been carefully targeted to address the most pressing issues facing our Nation right now: getting kids back to school, getting workers back to work, and ensuring that we have the healthcare resources necessary to defeat the virus.

The HEALS Act will provide economic incentives to help businesses retain workers. It will give additional support to hard-hit small businesses. It will provide checks to American families to help them weather the economic challenges that they are facing. It will give schools more than \$100 billion to help them safely reopen so kids and college students aren't missing out on the academic, social, and emotional benefits of in-person learning.

It will direct funds to diagnosis, vaccines, and treatments. It will ensure that medical professionals, small businesses, and school districts doing their best to protect Americans don't face frivolous lawsuits from predatory trial lawyers.

It will provide incentives for manufacturing personal protective equipment in the United States to help ensure that we never again face the kinds of shortages we have seen with the coronavirus. And more.

Now it is time for Democrats to come to the negotiating table so that we can arrive at a bipartisan bill and get this relief into the hands of Americans. I was disappointed to hear of the Democratic leader's partisan screeds yesterday and today on the Senate floor, although I did appreciate his ability to—with a straight face, I might add—simultaneously characterize Republican relief efforts as insufficient while touting a House bill that mentions the word “cannabis” more often than the word “job” and actually contains less money for schools than the Republican bill.

No one is going to get everything they want with this bill, and Democrats are not going to be able to implement their socialist wish list, but if we work together, we can get real relief into the hands of Americans. I hope the Democrats will join us.

REMOTE AND MOBILE WORKER RELIEF ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, during New York's toughest moments during the pandemic, medical professionals

from around the country came to hard-hit New York City to help. They formed an essential part of the city's medical response, and they undoubtedly saved lives. They are deserving of New York's profound gratitude—and apparently of something else: tax bills. That is right. In May, New York Governor Andrew Cuomo announced that New York would be levying income tax on any money these medical professionals made while they were there.

Now, individuals can generally receive a tax credit in their home State for income tax paid to another State, thus avoiding double taxation of their income, but since New York has one of the highest income taxes in the country, a lot of these medical professionals will be facing a higher than normal tax bill on any money they earn in New York. The situation is even worse for residents of States without an income tax, like my home State of South Dakota. Medical professionals from those States will simply have to absorb the full cost of this unexpected bill.

The healthcare workers who traveled to New York are not alone in facing a complicated tax situation. For Americans who regularly spend limited time working in different States throughout the year, the situation can be even worse. A traveling nurse, for example, or a corporate trainer might work in not just one but several additional States during a given year, and navigating the resulting income tax situation can be incredibly complicated.

Some States, like New York, aggressively tax individuals they deem to have earned income within their borders, even if the income in question is just the salary they earned from their employer while attending a 2-day training conference in the State. Other States allow nonresidents to work for longer periods—as long as 60 days in some cases—before they require an individual to file an income tax return.

Navigating different States' requirements can be a real burden for both employees and employers and can discourage interstate commerce. It is particularly challenging for small businesses, which frequently lack the in-house tax staff and tracking capabilities of larger organizations.

This situation cries out for a solution. For the past four Congresses, I have introduced legislation—the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act—to create a uniform standard for mobile workers. Under my bill, if you spent 30 days or fewer working in a different State, you would be taxed as normal by your home State. If you spent more than 30 days working in a different State, you would be subject to that other State's income tax in addition to the income tax in your home State. Having a universal rule like this would make life a lot easier for workers and for employers.

In June I introduced an updated version of my mobile workforce bill—the Remote and Mobile Worker Relief Act, which I am pleased to announce

has been included in the HEALS Act, the phase 4 coronavirus relief package the Republicans introduced yesterday. Like my original mobile workforce bill, the Remote and Mobile Worker Relief Act would create a uniform, 30-day standard governing State income tax liability for mobile workers, but my new bill goes further and addresses some of the particular challenges faced by mobile and remote workers as a result of the coronavirus.

The Remote and Mobile Worker Relief Act would establish a special 90-day standard for healthcare workers who travel to another State to help during the pandemic. This should ensure that no healthcare worker faces an unexpected tax bill for the contributions he or she makes to fighting the coronavirus.

My new bill also addresses the possible tax complications that could face remote workers as a result of the pandemic. During the coronavirus crisis, many workers who usually travel to their offices every day have ended up working from home. This doesn't present a tax problem for most employees, but it does present a possible problem for workers who live in a different State than the one in which they work.

Workers who live in a different State from the one in which they work are subject to income tax from both States, but under current State tax laws, they usually pay most or all of their State income taxes to the State in which they earn their income rather than their State of residence. However, now that some workers who usually work in a different State have been working from home, there is a risk that their State of residence could consider the resulting income as allocated to and taxable by it as well. That could mean a higher tax bill for a lot of workers.

My bill would preempt this problem by codifying the pre-pandemic status quo. Under my bill, if you plan to work in North Carolina but had to work from home in South Carolina during the pandemic, your income would still be taxed as if you were going into the office in North Carolina every day, just as it would have been if the pandemic had never happened.

Relief for mobile workers is a bipartisan idea. A version of my original mobile workforce bill has passed the House of Representatives multiple times, and the only reason it hasn't advanced so far in the Senate is because of the opposition of a handful of States that aggressively tax—you have got it—temporary workers.

Now that the pandemic has highlighted the challenges facing mobile workers and the potential challenges facing remote workers, I am pleased that my legislation will be considered here in the Senate as part of the broader coronavirus relief package that we hope to pass in the next couple of weeks. I am grateful to Chairman GRASSLEY for his support for this legislation.

It is unconscionable—unconscionable—that we would allow healthcare workers who risked their own lives to care for individuals in coronavirus-stricken States to be punished with unexpected tax bills. We need to make sure that Americans who work from home to help slow the spread of the virus don't face a complicated tax situation or an unexpectedly high tax bill as a result.

Americans have faced enough challenges over the past several months. Let's make sure tax problems are not among them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to talk about long-term care and a number of related challenges that confront our country, especially at this time.

One of the most horrific numbers in all of the horror that we have seen in the aftermath of the onset of the virus and COVID-19 disease and the jobs and economic crisis that have followed it is the number of deaths in long-term care settings.

When you combine the deaths of residents in nursing homes and other similar settings—sometimes called long-term care or even congregate settings—with the deaths of workers, we know that the number now exceeds 59,000 Americans. About 40 percent of all the deaths are either a resident of a long-term care facility or a worker in those facilities.

So we are talking about those Americans today—those families—when we consider what we do next because no one here, I don't think—I don't care what side of the aisle, what point of view, who you are, what State you are from, no one in this body or in the House would want to accept the idea that, say, 4 months from today, or 5 months or 6 months, another 59,000 or 60,000 people will have died in those settings.

We know a lot about how to get those numbers down. It is not one of those things where we can throw up our hands and say there is little that we can do. There is a lot we can do because Americans are smart, innovative, and caring, and a lot of smart people have figured out how to get those numbers down.

So 59,000—more than 59,000—Americans is unacceptable. Also, 40 percent of all the deaths going forward is also unacceptable. About a month ago, I came to the floor with some of my colleagues, and we pressed for a vote on

the solutions we need to save lives in nursing homes and also protect the workforce. The majority blocked the vote. Since then, the Senate has done nothing when it comes to this issue that has impacted so many families and so many communities. We have a chance now.

I realize sometimes when a bill gets blocked that that isn't the end of the story and that the individual or the party blocking might have a different idea, a better idea, a different solution, a better approach. If that is the case with the majority, we need to hear it. I would hope that a solution, a remedy, a strategy to get the 59,000-death number down would include the resources to do it because this isn't a circumstance where you can just wish it away. This isn't a circumstance where you can just move a little bit of policy around. We need resources, and I will talk more about them.

We know that yesterday Senate Republicans released their plan for the next piece of legislation relating to COVID-19 and the economy. This proposal is 2 months—a full 2 months—after the House passed the Heroes Act to bring relief to the millions of Americans who are suffering, families who are suffering, not only in the context of long-term care—having lost a loved one, a resident, or a worker in their family—but they are suffering for other reasons as well.

We know the unemployment rate is intolerably too high. In my home State of Pennsylvania—just imagine this—the number was 1-plus million people out of work in April. Thankfully, that number went down in the month of May, but it only went down to 849,000 people out of work.

I was hoping, as I know everyone was in the State, that the June number would fall precipitously and maybe by the same percentage, so 849,000 people would go well into the 700s and maybe even into the 600,000s and would keep going down from there. Unfortunately, in the month of June, it went from 849,000 to about 821,000 people out of work. I don't think I have seen unemployment numbers like that in my home State in my lifetime.

The 13.4 percent unemployment in May dropped but only went down to 13 percent. Just by way of comparison, in the great recession of just roughly a decade ago, Pennsylvania's unemployment rate went way up, as it did in a lot of other States. It stopped at 10 percent. Some counties were above 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent or higher. Statewide, it never really went above 10 percent.

We are now in our third month of unemployment rates well above 10 percent. It was 16 percent in April, almost 13.5 percent in May, and now 13 percent exactly now. We have a lot of work to do.

For purposes of today's discussion, I wanted to talk about what we can do in the long-term care context. The Republican proposal of yesterday makes no

meaningful investment to save lives in nursing homes. The policies that address long-term care in this proposal are insufficient. I think that is an understatement, but I will let that go for now.

There is no investment in home and community-based services, and there is no funding to reward the heroes on the frontlines. Some people might say: What do you mean by home and community-based services? I don't understand that. I am not sure what you mean.

We know that in the United States we have a number of settings where care is delivered—care for older citizens, older Americans, and care for people with disabilities. In the nursing home context, of course, that is skilled care in a facility, in a so-called congregate setting. Depending on which number you believe, in the United States we have between 1.3 and 1.5 million Americans there. We also have a lot of Americans who are getting their care—very important care for a senior or for someone with a disability—in a home setting or in a community-based setting, but the funding doesn't flow in that direction very often. So we are trying to change that because, obviously, if you are an older American, you might have certain conditions that make you even more susceptible, more vulnerable in the context of COVID-19. In many cases, it will be preferable to have you in a home setting or community-based setting.

But if you are in those settings, we have to invest in the workers who do that heroic work in both nursing homes, in homes, and in community-based settings, because the care is not going to be what it needs to be if we are not helping the workforce. I think most people agree with that.

Just as we cannot allow another 3 or 4 months to go by with 59,000 people dying, we also cannot allow the conflict here in the Senate to stop us from making progress in long-term care. We have to help nursing homes at the same time as we demand more of them. We need to invest in what we know works.

I have a bill, S. 3768, introduced with Senator WHITEHOUSE. The name of the bill is the Nursing Home COVID-19 Protection and Prevention Act. It would dedicate \$20 billion in emergency funding for proven practices. We would spend \$20 billion to get that death number down and also to get the case number down.

We are concerned, as well, about the high number of cases. We need to invest in best practices that some long-term care settings were investing in way back in early March, and some long-term care facilities got much better results. They had fewer cases and lower numbers of deaths because they were investing in these best practices. But to invest \$20 billion in emergency funding for these proven best practices, I think, is a bargain to get the death number down and get the case number down.

This bill will help nursing homes become a lot better and become more proficient at a practice called cohorting. It is real simple. That just means separating people in the nursing home. You separate the residents with COVID-19 from the residents who don't have it. When that basic practice is in place and when it is operative, it is something that a lot of places need help with. There are, obviously, costs involved in that. There may be costs because you have to do retrofitting. There may be costs in terms of needing additional staff.

But that is only part of it. The bill also allows nursing homes to provide for their workers, these heroes who are on the frontlines every day. Obviously, if you are on the frontlines every day, you are an essential worker. There are all these phrases and descriptions of these workers. Those who are at the front of the frontline are those in healthcare, because they are not only going out every day and providing an essential service, but they are closest to the risk. That includes folks who work in hospitals and other settings, of course. That is for certain. But it also includes people who work in nursing homes and at home and in community-based service settings.

Those are folks whom we call heroes, and it is nice to call them heroes. It is nice to say they are doing great work. It is nice to pat them on the back, but what we should be doing is paying them more for the sacrifice they make for the country.

The analogy, of course, is the GI bill. I have a bill that would add similar education benefits to those frontline workers, those heroes.

But at a minimum, they should get premium pay and overtime pay. They should also have essential benefits, and we should help them with childcare. You can't say: You have got to be on the frontlines; you have got to be on the front of the front lines, and you have to go to work every day because we need your essential skilled work to care for the most vulnerable, but you are on your own with childcare. Good luck.

We haven't done much to help them with that.

My bill also includes strong resident protections—"resident" meaning residents of nursing homes—to prevent evictions to homeless shelters and to provide an extra check on nursing home quality.

All these things I just recited in the bill, the Republican proposal doesn't have. I think the time is long overdue for Congress to take action to deal with what can only be described as an American tragedy—a preventable American tragedy. No one would argue—I certainly would not argue—that the 59,000-plus number could be zero. It is not what we are saying. What we are saying is you can bring the number down. If we bring the number down, even a little bit, it is worth it to save lives and to reduce the num-

ber of cases, but I think we can do a lot better than that.

Last week, a coalition made up of representatives from the nursing home industry, direct service professionals, AARP, the Alzheimer's Association, Catholic Charities, The Arc, and the Service Employees International Union came together to write to Senate leadership to demand this action and more. Think about that group. That is not a group that is always on the same page. They have often direct conflicts on a lot of issues, but they have all come together to support the residents in nursing homes and those in other settings and the workers because that is how dire it is. Groups that are often in conflict on legislation are together on this. Here is part of what they wrote to the Senate leadership: "The urgent need to save lives, prevent the spread of the virus, and address the services and support older adults and people with disabilities need cannot be overstated."

In addition to nursing home supports, this coalition called for dedicated funds for home and community-based services under Medicaid that I described earlier. I have a bill to do that. The House-passed Heroes Act, in fact, does that. The Heroes Act passed 2 months ago, and here we are without a bill ready to vote on in the Senate.

I sent a letter with 28 of my colleagues yesterday to urge Leader MCCONNELL to move these policies forward. We know that over 2.5 million older adults and people with disabilities depend on these services to be able to continue living in their own homes. These 2.5 million seniors and people with disabilities are folks who are not in a nursing home or other congregate setting. They are, by definition, in their homes or in a community-based setting. They are receiving their supports and services in their homes, where they are less likely to be exposed to the virus and often are able to see their families.

Just to give you one example, there is Michelle Mitchell of Allentown, PA—on the eastern side of our State, almost at the New Jersey border. Michelle is a person who benefits from the services. She has a lifelong disability—cerebral palsy—which affects the use of her arms and legs. She holds multiple degrees and is a full-time faculty member at a local college.

Every single day, Michelle Mitchell has the benefit of a personal care attendant who helps Michelle get out of bed, helps her to bathe, helps her to dress, and helps her to eat. Without Medicaid home and community-based services, thousands of people with similar needs to Michelle would not be able to live at home and work and interact with neighbors and friends. Home and community-based services keep Michelle safe, they keep her healthy, and they keep her engaged.

But the agencies that provide these vital services are facing barriers. A survey of home and community-based

services providers conducted by the group ANCOR found that 68 percent of providers have had to close some of their services to people with intellectual or developmental disabilities. This same survey found that over half of the agencies had faced significant additional expenses because of pandemic expense.

We know that life has changed for so many Americans and so many institutions. This is one of these agencies that do such good work. Some of the expenses they face include increased levels of overtime, purchases of personal protective equipment, and additional training for workers. Perhaps most unsettling is that the agencies that provide essential services to older adults and people with disabilities don't have sufficient funding to keep offering services for more than 1 month if payments stop. This lack of cash on hand illustrates how fragile the home and community-based services system is.

Yesterday morning, administrators in Pennsylvania said that if home and community-based services were not available, thousands of additional people would need to enter nursing homes, which again, is a congregate setting, where the likelihood of contracting the virus is higher than a lot of other settings. That, of course, would put them at greater risk of contracting the virus and much greater risk of dying because of this horrible pandemic.

When we talk about investing in home and community-based services, that is tied to the goal of getting not just the case number down but the death number down.

The proposal by Republicans yesterday makes clear that they are not focused on this crisis. There is no investment in home and community-based services at all. The response to nursing homes is wholly insufficient. The level of funding provided in the proposal, in my judgment, is an insult to older Americans. It is an insult to people with disabilities and their families, and it is an insult to the workers who support them. Claiming that people with disabilities and seniors are supported in this legislation is just not true.

On top of the lack of funding, the bill blows a hole in the protections provided by the ADA, or the Americans with Disabilities Act, for people with disabilities. To ensure that seniors and people with disabilities are kept safe and healthy during this public health crisis, we need to ensure that strong policies are in place to keep nursing homes safe, and we need to ensure that there is dedicated funding for home and community-based services.

I am calling for an investment in both settings—home and community-based services—for seniors and people with disabilities, as well as investments in proven strategies that we know will help nursing homes and also get the death numbers down. To meet our responsibilities to those who are most at risk—the most vulnerable among us—the Senate should include

these provisions that I have described in the next COVID-19 legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF INDEPENDENT LIVING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES MADE POSSIBLE BY THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 AND CALLING FOR FURTHER ACTION TO STRENGTHEN HOME AND COMMUNITY LIVING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, there is one more item to address before I relinquish the microphone.

We know that yesterday was the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act, to which I just referred—the so-called ADA. This is legislation that Congress should be very proud of because of how much it has ensured that millions of Americans with disabilities have been able to exercise their rights as Americans. We still have some work to do on the goals of the ADA, but it is a good anniversary to remember and to celebrate. So, in honor of the anniversary, I offer this resolution to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 661, a resolution recognizing the importance of independent living for individuals with disabilities made possible by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and calling for further action to strengthen home and community living for individuals with disabilities, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 661) recognizing the importance of independent living for individuals with disabilities made possible by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and calling for further action to strengthen home and community living for individuals with disabilities.

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

Mr. CASEY. I know of no further debate.

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

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 661) was agreed to.

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

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

The preamble was agreed to.

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I congratulate our friend from Pennsylvania who has demonstrated that bipartisanship is not dead in the U.S. Congress. In fact, I learned a long time ago that bipartisanship, collegiality, and cooperation don't really make much news, so people do get sort of a misimpression sometimes as to how Congress functions. Let me just say there are plenty of people on both sides of the aisle who are actually interested in solving some of our Nation's biggest problems. Again, they aren't necessarily the ones you see on cable news or grabbing the headlines, but they are doing important work. I am proud to be part of a body that does bipartisan work and solves problems in working together.

HURRICANE HANNA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the weekend, as Texans continued to battle COVID-19, those in parts of the State came to face with another disaster at the same time. It just seems like the challenges keep coming. First, we are in a pandemic. Then George Floyd lost his life unnecessarily and raised our consciousness to the racial injustice that still exists in this country. Then we had a natural disaster like a hurricane. Hurricane Hanna made landfall in South Texas and brought heavy rains and high winds to communities that were already grappling with the pandemic, especially the Rio Grande Valley. On Sunday, nearly 300,000 homes were without power in South Texas, and power is still being restored in a number of those communities. Navigating dangerous floodwaters and downed power lines is difficult under normal circumstances, and when you add a highly contagious virus to the mix, as you can imagine, it presents a host of logistical challenges.

I first thank the first responders and emergency crews who have been working overtime these last few days to get our neighbors to safety and to restore their power as quickly as possible. There is a strong sense of community in South Texas and the Rio Grande Valley, and I have no doubt these communities will pull together and come out of this crisis stronger than before.

I have been talking to a number of the leaders in several of the counties that have been affected, and we will continue working with them to ensure they have the resources they need to sustain their response and recovery efforts in the short term and address those critical infrastructure needs in the long term.

I have also heard from a number of farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers whose crops have been flooded, and I expect to hear more in the coming days about how we might be helpful, especially, again, in this already challenging time.

HEALS ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as I said, the number of COVID-19 cases has surged in recent weeks in the Rio Grande Valley, South Texas, and throughout the State as well. Just a couple of weeks ago, Texas reported more than 10,000 new cases in a single day, and that happened 5 days in a row.

It certainly was a wake-up call for many who had not had taken the most effective precautions seriously—things like social distancing, good personal hygiene, the wearing of masks if you can't socially distance, and staying home if you are sick. It is amazing what we can do as individuals to stop the spread of this virus by doing those simple things. Unfortunately, some people let their guard down and didn't follow those protocols, so we saw a huge uptick in the number of cases. Thankfully, though, I think the message has been received and understood, and we have recently seen a gradual and encouraging decline in cases.

Yet, as the war against COVID-19 wages on, we can't afford to lose any additional ground whether from a public health perspective or from an economic recovery perspective. So I believe it is time for Congress to pass additional legislation to strengthen our fight. That is why my colleagues and I introduced the HEALS Act yesterday. This legislation builds on the significant progress we have made already in four bipartisan bills that have already passed the Congress and have been signed into law by President Trump that will sustain our effort to defeat this virus and recover economically.

This legislation will ensure that workers who had the rug pulled out from under them earlier this year will continue to receive enhanced unemployment benefits.

It will provide funding to help K-12 schools, colleges, and universities safely and effectively educate their students this fall whether that means there being a combination of online or in-person instruction.

It will send additional and needed assistance to our farmers, ranchers, and producers who are keeping our families fed in the midst of the pandemic, and it will give States and local governments the flexibility they have requested and that they need to use CARES Act funding where it is needed the most.

In the coming days, I will talk more about how this legislation supports the workers and institutions that have been hit the hardest by this virus, but, today, I would like to focus on the ways it bolsters our fight against the virus itself.

One of the most important ways we can do that is through testing. The ability to identify positive cases as early as possible is the key to stopping the spread of the virus. Yet, as we have learned, there are massive numbers of people who have the virus who don't even know it and don't experience any symptoms. In short, they don't even feel sick. What we have seen, whether

it be in multigenerational households or with the people who are most vulnerable to this virus—mainly, the elderly and the people with underlying health problems—is that they cannot be properly isolated unless we can identify the people who are carrying the virus even though they themselves may not be suffering any symptoms.

The first coronavirus package we passed made testing free. It removed the cost barrier that could prevent those who needed a test from receiving one. At the time, if you were asymptomatic, the CDC—Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—didn't recommend your getting a test. Some of that was because of the constraints on the numbers of tests that were available. The fact is, if you are not suffering from any symptoms, you are probably not highly motivated to go get a test because you may not even know you have the virus, and you may not know you need one.

We are testing a lot more now than we were back then. Congress has provided another \$26 billion to scale up testing, and we have gone from conducting an average of 145,000 tests a day nationwide in early April to more than 780,000 per day in mid-July. So that has been a dramatic improvement. What we know is there is more we need to do.

The HEALS Act, which we introduced yesterday, will provide an additional \$16 billion to support testing efforts. When combined with the approximately \$9 billion that still exists from the previous bills, it will make another \$25 billion available to strengthen our testing nationwide. This will help to improve our testing strategy and capacity and reduce the backlog that has left some Texans waiting more than 2 weeks for test results. These tests are not very useful if it takes 2 weeks to get the results.

Because we ramped up the number of people who were tested, the lab companies that were analyzing the tests ended up getting backlogged. Now we have taken corrective measures in cities like Dallas to make other testing available and bring that number down, but this has been a constant challenge. It needs to be as quick and easy as possible for folks not only to get tests but to get the results, and this funding helps to make sure there will be serious strides in support of that goal.

I know there are testing protocols that are being analyzed right now that may make this easier and may even make the results quicker. I know, for example, in the Texas A&M University System, Chancellor Sharp said he has contracted for 15,000 tests a month for students who will return on campus. Now, in his view, he said those students will probably be safer on campus than they will be back home, especially if they end up going to bars or other social venues and do not properly social distance or wear masks.

Beyond testing, we need additional support for the healthcare providers

who have been on the frontlines. In my State, I know the Governor has asked a number of hospitals in the hardest hit areas to defer elective surgeries. As I have come to learn and as the Presiding Officer, no doubt, knows, that is how hospitals pay the bills. Many of the people who show up either get charity care or the payment through Medicaid or Medicare is less than that from private health insurance, so hospitals need a mix of elective surgeries and other treatments so they will have full insurance coverage in order to balance their books overall.

Congress has already provided \$175 billion for a healthcare provider relief fund, which has given hospitals, clinics, and physicians the resources they need to continue treating COVID-19 patients and stay afloat financially. So far, more than 20,000 hospitals and healthcare providers in my State alone have benefited from that funding, with over \$4.1 billion coming to Texas.

The HEALS Act will supplement that fund with an additional \$25 billion to help these providers navigate the surge in cases and maintain critical supplies like masks, gloves, and ventilators. If our hospitals don't have the personal protective equipment to protect the frontline staff, the resources to treat patients, or the funding to keep their doors open, we will be in bad, bad shape. This legislation will go a long way to making sure we don't ever reach that point.

In addition to supplementing the healthcare provider relief fund, this legislation will also support some of our most critical health resources. We know our community health centers are an important part of the safety net when it comes to accessing healthcare. This bill will provide \$7.6 billion to our community health centers, which usually serve people on a sliding scale based on their ability to pay. Some people have full insurance coverage; others are covered by Medicare or Medicaid; and some simply don't have the means to pay at all, but all are welcome and are treated at our community health centers.

We also send \$4.5 billion to mental health, suicide prevention, and substance use disorder services. We all know that the mitigation efforts we have all been engaged in by staying in our homes and not leaving for a period of time, as instructed by public health and other government officials, has exacted a very difficult toll on families, particularly on people who have had nowhere to go to escape somebody who has been abusing them in domestic violence scenarios or on people who are simply feeling a sense of isolation and a challenge to their mental health as they wonder how they are going to pay the bills and take care of their families. Maybe they have loved ones who are in nursing homes—the elderly are particularly vulnerable—whom they haven't been able to see because of the isolation efforts.

And then we know people will self-medicate with alcohol or drugs. So this

\$4.5 billion is important to help provide the mental health, suicide prevention, and substance use disorder services that are going to be needed not only right now but in the indefinite future.

We also provide an additional \$15 billion to the National Institutes of Health for research and an additional \$26 billion for vaccine research.

We know our frontline healthcare providers have gotten much, much better and saved many more lives by coming up with treatments that actually have been effective. Some of these are common prescription drugs that are used for other purposes that have been repurposed for treatment of COVID-19 symptoms.

We know that convalescent plasma, taken from people who have had the virus, who have developed immunities, when they donate blood, that plasma can actually be used to help treat patients with serious COVID-19 symptoms.

And we know that there are other treatments in progress, along with the race to get a vaccine. Ultimately, we know that the vaccine is going to be important to our ability to defeat and live with this virus.

But in the meantime, we know we need to learn to live with this virus in a way that protects our public health and allows us to safely reopen our economy.

So the last thing I want to mention is liability protection. Why is this so important?

Well, as many nonprofits or businesses think about reopening, thinking about kids going back to school safely—whether online and then transitioning to in person, or colleges and universities—we know that there are going to be a lot of lawsuits filed, second guessing why people didn't do something different, when, in fact, this pandemic has surprised all of us in so many ways.

And what this does is provide a safe harbor from legal liability for those individuals who followed government guidance in good faith. It can't be the fact that you would subject a frontline healthcare worker who had no choice but to put on personal protective equipment and go to work to treat patients—it would be a cruel joke to say: Now we are going to come back and file lawsuits against you and sue you for money damages because you didn't somehow know exactly what you were dealing with.

We know that frontline healthcare workers are performing a physically and mentally taxing job, made only more difficult by the fact we didn't understand exactly what we were dealing with, with this novel virus, and we are still learning more.

Well, I learned, for example, about a rural hospital where test kits are in short supply. In fact, it was especially true in the early days as testing infrastructure was being stood up, and I mentioned that a moment ago.

I learned about a hospital in a rural community outside Wichita Falls that

only had 12 tests available. Because of limited resources, a physician made the difficult decision not to test an ER patient for COVID-19 because the patient didn't meet the criteria set out by the Centers for Disease Control. The following day, that same patient went to Wichita Falls and received a test, and several days later found out that they tested positive.

Now, imagine you are that physician. You followed the CDC guidelines for testing; you tried to conserve the limited resources available in your community; but there is nothing stopping the patient from heading to the nearest lawyer's office and filing a lawsuit against you for somehow refusing them a test.

All of a sudden, you are scrambling to defend yourself in a lawsuit that, quite frankly, should not have been filed in the first place.

But I have spent enough time in courtrooms to know that many times lawsuits are not filed with the goal of actually prevailing on the merits; they are filed in order to gain a settlement because the cost of defending yourself can be large, indeed. And, in fact, if you are a business that has been hanging on by a thread, just the threat of that kind of litigation and the expense and energy it takes to defend that case, even though it lacks merit, could well cause you to throw in the towel or put you out of business.

So we have introduced, as part of this HEALS Act, legislation that will provide that safe harbor. It will not provide blanket immunity; it will not protect against intentional or reckless misconduct; but it would establish clear guardrails like those in a number of States. As a matter of fact, 30 different States have passed similar protections for their healthcare workers. Other States have done it in other categories, but it is important, I believe, for us to provide clear authority so people know what they are dealing with.

I would note, for example, that some of these same guardrails are very similar to those enacted by Executive order in the minority leader's home State of New York. I know the legislature has now sent Governor Cuomo another bill, basically, with the same framework, and he has not yet made a decision to sign that.

But overall the HEALS Act will help provide the resources Texas hospitals, clinics, and healthcare providers need to sustain and win this fight, while protecting our heroic healthcare workers from a second epidemic in the courtroom.

So I hope both sides of the aisle will work together, as we have in the past on COVID-19 response legislation, and make sure we can get a bill to the President's desk on a timely basis that delivers these and other necessary changes at a critical time for our country.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, Senator DURBIN and I have worked for months on an issue on rural healthcare. Whether it is in rural Illinois or it is in rural Oklahoma, there is a challenge dealing with rural hospitals and sustaining their viability.

So Senator DURBIN and I partnered together to determine what is the best way to get a solution that is a long-term solution to what they are currently facing with COVID-19.

While COVID-19 has impacted all types of businesses, rural hospitals have uniquely dealt with some very difficult challenges. Getting PPE early on in the process was much more challenging for rural hospitals than it was for urban—keeping doctors, managing separation, getting airflow areas in hospitals to manage the flow of the virus through areas, and also managing just patient count, where, for many rural hospitals, they just shut down because all elective surgery was stopped and such, and so they lost all of that income, though they still had all the employees. It was an exceptionally challenging thing, but it is challenging on top of the challenge that they have already faced for decades in just surviving in rural America.

So what Senator DURBIN and I have brought is a reasonable, nonpartisan solution to how we can deal with not only COVID-19 but to help rural hospitals long term.

Decades ago, Congress established something called the critical access hospital and made sure that those hospitals that were designated "critical access hospitals" would receive proper reimbursement from the Federal Government for healthcare services.

Many individuals in rural areas—in fact, the dominant proportion in many rural areas receiving healthcare are receiving it through Medicaid or Medicare. We want to make sure that those providers providing those high-need areas are reimbursed appropriately.

But, in 2006, Congress shifted the designation for critical access hospitals and took away something called the necessary provider, giving the flexibility to the States.

As a result of that action in 2006, we have seen the closure of 118 rural hospitals nationwide since that time period. The "critical access hospital" designation was created because of a string of hospital closures in the 1980s and early 1990s. Yet we have not responded in the way that we should from the change in statute in 2006.

Simply what we are trying to do is to give that flexibility back to States again. If they have a hospital in a rural area that is the only provider in that community that is a Medicare-dependent hospital or is a very small hospital

with fewer than 50 beds, that area has to be an area that is designated as a rural area. It can't just be any suburban area or any other type of hospital. It has to be a rural hospital in particular. It has to have a high percentage relative to the national average of individuals with income below the poverty line. Those hospitals in those locations could be designated by their States as a necessary provider and be treated as if they are a critical access hospital. What would that do? That would be a lifeline for reimbursement because now we have some rural hospitals designated as critical access and some hospitals that meet all the other criteria, but they may be 34 miles away from another hospital, so that hospital in that county dies while the other hospital survives. In my State, we have a critical access hospital 34 miles away from a hospital across the border in Texas, so the hospital in Oklahoma can't get the critical access designation and can't survive because 34 miles away there is a hospital in another State that has the critical access.

We need the flexibility in our States to be able to do this kind of designation. Senator DURBIN and I have run this through a lot of places and a lot of people, and we have gotten a lot of technical input in it to make sure this actually works for our rural hospitals and provides not just a short-term survival through COVID-19 but also provides long-term stability for them. This is the kind of work we should do together to make sure we stabilize those rural hospitals. They are a lifeline to people in rural America. They are a lifeline of employment, and they are a stable feature in every community. Without them, those communities dry up because people need access to healthcare, and this is the way that they can get it.

I am glad to partner with Senator DURBIN on this issue, and it is our hope to get this into the next bill dealing with COVID-19 in the days ahead. Quite frankly, it was our hope to get it into the last one—we didn't get it—and into the one before that. Surprisingly enough, everyone seems to be nodding their heads on both sides of the aisle saying: That is a good idea. That will be effective. We want to move it from "that is a good idea" to "done" for the sake of rural hospitals across the Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma. I could not have said it any better or more effectively than he just did.

Like Oklahoma, downstate Illinois has an area of smaller cities and rural towns and smalltown communities. Many of them are lucky enough to have great hospitals, and they love their hospitals. They are not only important sources of medical care; they are a major part of the local economy and really are a rallying point for com-

munities. Auxiliaries, volunteers, and so many people make these hospitals the focal point when you visit these communities. They are so proud of them.

Of course, we are worried about what this current pandemic is going to do. I have had conference calls with leaders from almost 120 hospitals across Illinois. I invited Members of Congress in, so we had bipartisan exchanges about the current state of affairs. One hospital CEO from Crawford County, downstate along the Indiana border, told me that he used to pay 22 cents for a surgical gown, and now he pays between \$11 and \$20 for each one. Hospitals are facing limited access to reagents, swabs, and supplies that they need. The Heroes Act would direct the administration to utilize the Defense Production Act to help solve that problem, and I commend Senators MURPHY and BALDWIN for their legislation, which I am joining, to do the same.

One of the most profound consequences of the pandemic is the impact on the solvency of these hospitals. Across Illinois, rural hospitals are the heart and soul of the community; otherwise, people drive literally for hours to get medical care, sometimes in emergency situations. They are important parts of the local economy. We think downstate hospitals generate \$5 billion into our State economy each year, and I don't doubt that.

This pandemic has pushed them to the brink. Even prior to this crisis, they were facing financial uncertainty. Half of rural hospitals were operating in the red. One in four were at risk of closure. As the Senator from Oklahoma mentioned, 120 have closed across the Nation in the past decade.

We have fared a little better in Illinois, but we are worried about the future. When a rural hospital closes, not only do doctors disappear, but jobs disappear, and businesses struggle to stay.

The coronavirus pandemic has accelerated and compounded the strains we face. We believe our Illinois hospitals are losing \$1.4 billion each month. Many, like those near nursing homes and meat processing plants, have had to expand surge staffing to deal with COVID patients. All have been forced to cancel outpatient and elective services. In Illinois, 70 percent of rural hospital revenues are from outpatient services. The same is true in neighboring States like Kentucky.

Nationwide, rural hospitals have on average only 33 days of cash on hand. There is an immediate need to stabilize, and that is why we have come up with this bipartisan plan. Senator JAMES LANKFORD and I have introduced a bill called the Rural Hospital Closure Relief Act. It is supported by the American Hospital Association and the National Rural Health Association. It would update Medicare's "critical access hospital" designation to provide flexibility around the 35-mile distance requirement, so more rural hospitals would qualify for additional payments from the Federal Government.

We project that six hospitals in Iowa and scores more in Illinois, New York, and Kentucky would qualify for this financial lifeline, securing their stability. We do it in a restrained, cost-effective manner by focusing on the hospitals that have faced financial losses and are located in areas with a shortage of healthcare providers. It is common sense.

This bipartisan bill is a priority for us. We want to make it a priority for the Senate, and we hope to do so. We know that we have come to this discussion with a good, encouraging conversation with Senator GRASSLEY today in support of the Iowa Rural Health Association. The CEO and leader of the Kentucky Rural Health Association projects that more than 18 rural hospitals in that State are at high risk of closure. We hope to make that point very clear to the majority leader. Several of them would be helped by our legislation.

With a spike in COVID-19 cases across rural America, we have seen hospitals reaching capacity, and we need to make sure that our hospitals—the ones we are talking about in rural areas—survive. The health and economic toll of this crises demands it. I hope that Democrats and Republicans in the Senate include this in any bipartisan package. The cost of inaction will be disastrous.

Senator LANKFORD and I were prepared to seek passage of this bill by unanimous consent today, but we have been encouraged to continue negotiating with our colleagues to see if we can make it part of the package—a timely part of the package—in the near future. I hope that is the case, and we will hold off from any unanimous consent request because of that hope.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 6

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, last month, in a landmark decision, the Supreme Court rejected President Trump's effort to repeal deportation protections for Dreamers. Those are the young immigrants who came to the United States as children.

In an opinion by Chief Justice John Roberts, the Court held that President Trump's attempt to rescind DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, was "arbitrary and capricious."

Those were the words of the Court.

More than a month later, the Trump administration has refused to restore the DACA Program despite the decision written by the Chief Justice. The administration is now in open defiance of the Supreme Court when it comes to the DACA Program. The stakes are too high, both for the rule of law and the lives of these young Dreamers, for us to ignore it. Republicans and Democrats in Congress need to come together to compel the President to immediately comply with the Supreme Court mandate.

On June 4, 2019, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 6. In 2019, they

passed H.R. 6, the Dream and Promise Act. This legislation would give Dreamers a path to citizenship, and it passed on a strong bipartisan vote. The Dream and Promise Act has been pending in the Senate on the desk of Senator MCCONNELL for more than a year.

Last month, I sent a letter signed by all 47 Democratic Senators, calling on Majority Leader MCCONNELL to immediately schedule a vote on the Dream and Promise Act. As of today, Senator MCCONNELL has not even replied to this letter. Since Senator MCCONNELL refuses to take any action to address the plight of these Dreamers, I will ask unanimous consent at this point for the Senate to pass the bipartisan Dream and Promise Act.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 112, H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, reserving the right to object, Senator DURBIN knows extremely well that unanimous consent is trying to get all 100 Senators to agree on something.

Senator DURBIN has done remarkable work for years advocating on the issue of immigration, and he knows exceptionally well what a difficult issue this is. He has been involved in countless debates and negotiations dealing with this issue, and there is certainly not 100 percent agreement on a House bill that passed in 2019 on how to solve immigration.

So it is not going to pass. I certainly will object in a moment to this.

This bill far exceeds just dealing with DACA. As this body knows very well, there were four separate votes dealing with immigration in February of 2018. At that time, three of those dealt with the issue of DACA, and none of those actually were able to get 60 votes to be able to pass.

The Trump administration was very engaged in those negotiations, and the White House itself brought a proposal to deal with DACA and multiple other issues with immigration. It failed to get 60 votes to move it in 2018, and the Court at that time swooped it up and said they wanted to be able to look at it.

Now 2 years later, the Court finally responded, putting it back into the administration's hands and, quite frankly, back into Congress's hands.

I will tell you, I wish the Court had not engaged in 2018 because there was a lot of engagement from the Trump administration, from the Senate, and from the House to be able to come to a point of resolution, but that has to begin again with bipartisan negotiations through a very complicated issue.

President Trump has stated numerous times in public interviews and in private conversations that he wants to do something to take care of those kids in DACA, but that is not what this particular bill does. This particular bill far exceeds just the DACA population. In fact, the DACA population is defined as the group that was 16 years old and in the United States before June 15, 2017. This bill deals with 18-year-olds in the United States just 4 years ago and before, greatly increasing the population in the conversation. So this is not just a DACA conversation; this is a much larger bill than just a DACA bill in that sense.

While I do agree we do need to continue bipartisan conversations—and President Trump has expressed a desire to engage in that—I think this is something the White House, the House, and the Senate should work out and not try to have all 100 Senators agree on something that comes to the floor today that has not gone through the proper debate and does not have all three bodies engaged in the process.

With that, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I regret the fact that the Senator objected. I am not surprised, but I understand his statement. I do hope that he feels as I do that we should be working in a bipartisan fashion to find an answer to this challenge.

I have been working on this Dream Act for a number of years. Over 780,000 young people have signed up for DACA, and many more are currently eligible, and I would like to address their plight in just a moment here on the floor. But I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for the encouraging words to continue this effort. It is long past time for us to find a bipartisan answer to this situation.

It was, in fact, 10 years ago when I joined with Senator Richard Lugar, a Republican from Indiana, on a bipartisan basis to call on President Obama to use his legal authority to protect Dreamers from deportation. President Obama responded by creating the DACA Program. DACA provides temporary protection from deportation of Dreamers if they register with the government, pay a fee, and pass criminal and national security background checks.

I got started on this 20 years ago. I know you have to be patient to serve in the U.S. Senate, but I am losing my patience, not for my own plight and situation but for these young people. We know their circumstances. They were brought to this country as infants, toddlers, and little kids. They grew up here thinking this was home. It was home. They went to our schools. They pledged allegiance to our flag. They counted themselves as just another American kid. Then, sometime when they were teenagers, mom and dad sat down with them and said: We have a serious matter to discuss with you. It

turns out you are undocumented. Technically, you are illegal in your presence in the United States, and let us warn you that at any moment you could be stopped, arrested, and deported. In fact, they might even drag many members of the family along with you if that circumstance should apply.

Imagine growing up with that as a teenager, with all the things you worry about in adolescence, worrying about a knock on the door and deportation that might drag along other members of your family. That is how these kids lived. That is how they grew up.

One of them came to my attention in Chicago. Her name is Tereza Lee. Tereza came to the United States originally from Korea through Brazil. She came to Chicago with her family on a visitor visa at the age of 2. Her family stayed. Most of them reached legal status, but they never filed any papers for Tereza. She didn't discover until she was in high school that she was an undocumented person in America.

She just happened to have an extraordinary talent as a musician. She signed up for a program known as the MERIT Music Program. They taught her how to play the piano, which she had already started learning. She was found so phenomenal that by the end of her high school years, her instructor said: Why don't you apply to the great music schools of America—Juilliard or the Manhattan conservatory of music?

She started to fill out the application with her mom and came to the section where it said "citizenship," and she said: What are we supposed to put there, Mom?

And her mom said: I don't know. We better call the office of Senator DURBIN.

They called us, and we learned for the first time of Tereza's situation. Under the law of America, despite the fact that this 2-year-old girl who arrived in the United States and now is 18 years of age—under the laws of the United States, she was compelled to leave the United States for 10 years and apply to come back in.

How could you do that? She didn't choose to come to this country. She didn't choose not to file for the right legal papers. She was the victim of this situation. So, on her behalf, I introduced the DREAM Act, and over the years, I have tried my level best in every way imaginable to pass it and make it the law of the land so that young people just like her can have a chance to earn their way to permanent status in the United States and ultimately to citizenship.

I often fail to tell the end of this story, and I want to tell it because many people say: What ever happened to Tereza Lee? Well, the fact is, she was accepted by the Manhattan conservatory of music, and these wonderful people in Chicago—including my dear friend Joan Harris—said: We will pay for her education. She is so good.

They did it. She finished. She married an American Jazz musician and

became an American citizen by virtue of that decision. They now have three children. She just emailed me last week. She just got her Ph.D. in music. She has performed in Carnegie Hall. She is an amazing young woman. She was the first Dreamer.

That is not a unique story. I have come to the floor over 100 times and told stories just like that of young people brought to the United States who are remarkable and who could really add so much to this country.

There have been some 800,000 Dreamers who have come forward to sign up for DACA, the program we discussed earlier. DACA, under President Obama, by Executive order, unleashed the full potential of many of these Dreamers for the first time. They could be public about their status, go to college, and do things they dreamed of. Many of them today are contributing to this country as soldiers and teachers and owners of small businesses and healthcare workers.

More than 200,000 DACA recipients are essential, critical, infrastructure workers. That is not my term; that is a term of the Donald Trump Department of Homeland Security. That is how they are classified: essential, critical infrastructure workers; 200,000—a fourth of the DACA recipients. Among them are 41,700 DACA recipients in the healthcare industry—doctors, intensive care nurses, paramedics, respiratory therapists, and health professionals like the one I will talk about in just a moment.

But on September 5, 2017, despite his assurances to me and so many others that he would take special care of these young people, these Dreamers, President Trump repealed DACA. Hundreds of thousands of Dreamers faced losing their work permits and being deported out of the United States to countries they didn't even remember.

Federal courts stepped in and ordered the Trump administration to continue the DACA Program while they resolved in court whether the President's actions were proper. However, Dreamers who have not received DACA protection have been blocked from applying for this protection now for almost 3 years. For example, children cannot apply for DACA until they reach the age of 15. The Center for American Progress estimates that approximately 300,000 Dreamers have been unable to apply for this program since President Trump abolished it—or tried to—on September 5, 2017. Fifty-five thousand of those young people have turned 15 in that period of time.

Since the Supreme Court decision more than a month ago, the Trump administration—the Trump administration—has failed to comply with Chief Justice of the Supreme Court John Roberts' order rejecting the repeal of DACA and requiring the Trump administration to reopen the program. The Trump administration is knowingly avoiding and violating the order of this Court.

Two weeks ago, I joined with Senator KAMALA HARRIS in leading a letter from 33 Senators to the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security, Chad Wolf. Our letter called on the Trump administration to immediately comply with the Supreme Court decision and reopen DACA for those who want to seek admission or at least protection under that program. So far, of course, we have not received a response to our letter, but that is not unusual with this administration.

Ten days ago, a Federal judge issued an order for the Trump administration to follow the law and follow the order of the Supreme Court and begin accepting new applications for DACA. So earlier today, Acting Secretary Chad Wolf of the Department of Homeland Security finally responded. Here is what he said: "The Department of Homeland Security will take action to thoughtfully consider the future of DACA policy, including whether to fully rescind the program." He said: "In the interim, DHS will reject all initial requests for DACA." That is in open defiance of the order of the Supreme Court in the decision issued by Chief Justice John Roberts—open defiance by the President and his administration. What on Earth is this supposed to mean?

If the Trump administration wants to repeal DACA again—and I pray that they won't—they can certainly try, and they can see if that action would be arbitrary, capricious, or would somehow withstand legal scrutiny. But under our system of separation of powers, the executive branch of government does not get to "thoughtfully consider" whether to comply with a Supreme Court order for some undefined period of time.

Let's be clear. The Supreme Court rejected the repeal of DACA. That means DACA returns to its original status, and the Trump administration must reopen the program, and they must do it now. Instead, Mr. Wolf is saying the DHS is going to turn away 300,000 Dreamers eligible for DACA who have not had a chance to apply because the case has been in court.

Mr. Wolf claims the administration is following the law, but it is notable that the Department of Homeland Security website still features a statement from a DHS official saying the Supreme Court's decision "has no basis in law."

After the Supreme Court decision, President Trump tweeted: "I have wanted to take care of DACA recipients better than the Do Nothing Democrats, but for 2 years they have refused to negotiate." Well, here is the reality, and it isn't the President's tweet. The President has rejected numerous bipartisan deals to protect the Dreamers.

Take one example—February 15, 2018. The Senate considered bipartisan legislation by Republican Senator MIKE ROUNDS and Independent Senator ANGUS KING. The bill, which included a path to citizenship for Dreamers, was supported by a bipartisan majority of

Senators. It failed to reach 60 votes that it needed to pass the Senate because President Trump opposed it. Remember when he said that the Democrats were at fault here, that there were no bipartisan measures to solve the problem? Here was a bipartisan measure that he openly opposed. On the same day, the Senate voted on the President's immigration proposal. The Trump plan failed by a bipartisan majority of 39 to 60.

Over the years, I have come to the floor of the Senate many times to tell the stories of Dreamers. These stories tell the whole story, as far as I am concerned, as to what is at stake with the future of DACA and the Dream Act.

Let me tell you the story today about this young man, Juan Alvarez—125th Dreamer—whom I have come to the floor to introduce to the Senate and the people who are watching.

He came to the United States from Mexico at 3 years of age and grew up in Compton, CA. A great student. From a young age, he wanted to get involved in healthcare, but because of his immigration status—undocumented—he was unable to attend medical or nursing school. Instead, he went to the California State University in Long Beach, where he completed a bachelor of science degree in nutrition and dietetics. Today, thanks to DACA, Juan is working as a dietitian at an acute care hospital in Los Angeles.

He sent me a letter, and here is what he said:

I never imagined that I would be able to work in the field that I love and am passionate about—but thanks to DACA, that was made possible. Simply said, DACA has opened doors for me that I once thought were bolted shut and completely out of reach.

Now, Juan Alvarez is on the frontline of the coronavirus pandemic. He is part of this hospital's critical care team treating patients with coronavirus. Juan's role is to ensure that patients receive adequate nutrition during their hospital stay so they survive. Here is what he said about this experience:

I am in constant fear of being infected and then infecting my family. But as an essential healthcare worker, I continue to show up to work and put myself at risk so that I can continue to serve my patients. While I do it to continue to help my patients and make sure that they are well nourished and strong enough to fight off the virus, I cannot set aside how worried I am myself.

I want to thank Juan Alvarez for his service. He is an immigrant health hero. He is a DACA health hero. He is putting himself and his family at risk to save the lives of other Americans. He shouldn't have to worry about whether he is going to be deported.

Will America be a stronger country if we tell him to leave or if we send him back to Mexico, which he doesn't even remember, or if we allow him to become a citizen and to use his skills and education and training to continue to help others? I think the answer is clear.

Juan and hundreds of thousands of other Dreamers are counting on those

of us who serve in the Senate to solve this crisis that President Trump has created.

I am sorry there was an objection to the Dream and Promise Act today. So long as I am a U.S. Senator, I will continue to come to this floor day after day, week after week, and month after month until the Senate gives Juan Alvarez a chance to become part of America's future. It would be an American tragedy to deport this wonderful and talented young healthcare worker who is literally saving lives as we meet today in the Senate.

We must ensure that Juan and hundreds of thousands of others in our essential workforce are not forced to stop when the need for their service has never been greater. We must give them the chance they deserve to become part of the American family.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

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

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

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, today I rise to honor a leader, a fighter, and a hero: Congressman John Lewis.

A few years ago, I was fortunate enough to travel to Selma, AL, with Congressman Lewis to commemorate "Bloody Sunday," when the then 25-year-old activist helped to lead 600 people across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

At the end of the bridge, the marchers were attacked with billy clubs and tear gas. Congressman Lewis's skull was fractured. He bore the scars until the day he died.

And that weekend, 48 years later, the White police chief of Montgomery handed his police badge to Congressman Lewis and publicly apologized for the police not protecting him and the Freedom Marchers.

Forty-eight years is a long time for an apology, and it only happened because Congressman Lewis never quit fighting for progress, for civil rights, for economic justice, and for voting rights for every single American.

It was because of that spirit of persistence and resilience that I will always be in awe of Congressman John Lewis.

He never lost his faith that this country could be better, if only we put in the work. He never gave up on justice. He never stopped marching toward freedom.

John Lewis was born to sharecroppers in the Jim Crow South and dedicated his life to the civil rights movement.

As one of the original 13 Freedom Riders, he took on segregation. Despite being met by angry mobs, beatings, and arrests, Congressman Lewis didn't give up.

Wise beyond his years, he was the youngest speaker at the 1963 March on Washington, which he also helped to organize. His words from that day have become a rallying cry for all those seeking equality. As Congressman Lewis explained, "To those who have said, 'Be patient and wait,' we must say that we cannot be patient. We do not want our freedom gradually but we want to be free now."

In 1964, he coordinated efforts for the "Mississippi Freedom Summer," recruiting college students from around the country, including Minnesota, to join the movement to register Black voters across the South.

And still, he was far from done. In 1986, Congressman Lewis became the second African-American to be elected to Congress from Georgia since Reconstruction, propelled by the same Black voters he had helped to empower and mobilize.

Once in Congress, John Lewis never stopped fighting, for voting rights, for basic human rights like healthcare, and for a more just and equal America.

There are so many reasons that we will miss him dearly, his unwavering persistence being just one. But now, it is up to us. To honor his life and carry on his legacy, we must not quit. So let's pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, and let's all try and get in some good trouble.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JAMES "RUSTY" MITCHELL

• Ms. MCSALLY. Madam President, in the words of entrepreneur Henry Ford, "coming together is a beginning, staying together is progress, and working together is success." As you and I know all too well, the role of a mediator presents unique challenges. From negotiating contracts to facilitating dialogue among parties, very few have the skillset and dedication to produce favorable results.

Today, I am here to honor a man who exemplifies the qualities of a true leader and innovator: James "Rusty" Mitchell, the director of the Community Initiatives Team at Luke Air Force Base in Arizona. Mr. Mitchell will be retiring this month after over 39 years of government service to our country.

Upon completion of his undergraduate degree at the University of Southern California as an ROTC cadet, Mr. Mitchell was commissioned in 1976 to attend pilot training at the old Williams Air Force Base, which has a near and dear place to my heart, as I also attended it.

The culmination of an impressive 22-year USAF career as the commander of

the 21st Squadron, 56th Fighter Wing at Luke, he retired in 1998 as a lieutenant colonel with multiple honors, including the Defense Meritorious Service Medal; the USAF Meritorious Service Medal, with three oakleaf clusters; and the Air Force Commendation Medal.

After 3 years as a pilot with United Airlines, Mr. Mitchell returned to Luke to take the lead as the director of the newly created Community Initiatives Team, CIT. Working with all 14 jurisdictions around the air base, as well as the State of Arizona, Mr. Mitchell and his team took into account the interests of various stakeholders in the State, the Federal Government, and the local community. The results were beyond favorable. His team's efforts transformed the entire community.

CIT's first-class work on the Strategic Basing process led to the USAF selecting Luke to serve as the F-35A training site, which brought 144 F-35s and significant investments to the base. Through initiatives such as the FAA's approval of a Special Air Traffic Rule, which enhanced safety and reduced flying hour costs, Mr. Mitchell and his team have truly shown how essential their role has been. There is no question that this work strengthened the Maricopa Area's ties to Luke AFB.

Under Mr. Mitchell's leadership, CIT is now one of the country's best examples of how to bring community leaders, military families, and base leadership together. The outcome has all three of these groups rallying around one shared mission: to support the base's military personnel and readiness. As a Valley resident for more than 25 years himself, Mr. Mitchell's firsthand understanding has allowed him to personally address key issues at the base and in his community. His frequent appearances at city council meetings and active involvement in the broader community truly highlight his unwavering dedication to building bridges between Luke AFB and the public.

I would like to thank Lt. Col. (ret.) James "Rusty" Mitchell for his many years of service to our Nation, Luke AFB, and the Arizonans who call his community home. I have personally witnessed the many tremendous changes Rusty has made for Luke Air Force Base and the surrounding community. We will all be better off because of his selfless and tireless efforts. He will be sorely missed, and I wish him all the best in his retirement.●

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 Committee on Armed Services.

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

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-5157. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ethalfuralin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 10008-20-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5158. A communication from the Management Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Land Uses; Special Uses; Procedures for Operating Plans and Agreements for Powerline Facility Maintenance and Vegetation Management Within and Abutting the Linear Boundary of a Special Use Authorization for a Powerline Facility" (RIN0596-AD36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5159. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Mid-Session Review of the Budget of the U.S. Government for Fiscal Year 2021"; to the Committees on Appropriations; and the Budget.

EC-5160. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5161. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5162. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was originally declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5163. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule - Assessments, Mitigating the Deposit Insurance Assessment Effect of Participation in the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP), the PPP Liquidity Facility, and the Money Market Mutual Fund Liquidity Facility" (RIN3064-AF53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5164. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit

Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Matrix: Flood Act Civil Money Penalty (CMP) Calculation" (RIN3064-AE71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5165. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2019 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5166. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Lime Manufacturing Plants Residual Risk and Technology Review" (FRL No. 10009-60-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5167. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing Residual Risk and Technology Review" (FRL No. 10008-48-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5168. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Control of Sulfur Emissions From Stationary Boilers" (FRL No. 10012-77-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5169. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request for the Ajo PM10 Planning Area; Arizona" (FRL No. 10012-54-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5170. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2015 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 10012-75-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5171. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Revisions to NOX SIP Call and CAIR Rules" (FRL No. 10012-07-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5172. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Plan Elements for the Chicago Nonattainment Area for the 2008 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 10011-75-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5173. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "New Mexico: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions and Incorporation by Reference" (FRL No. 10011-49-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5174. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Attainment Plan for the Southwest Indiana Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 10012-09-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5175. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for Power Plants Electronic Reporting Revisions" (FRL No. 10011-53-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5176. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ocean Dumping: Modification of an Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site Offshore of Mobile, Alabama" (FRL No. 10012-27-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5177. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Early Termination of Peace Corps Volunteers: Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5178. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices; Petition for an Administrative Stay of Action: Electrical Stimulation Devices for Self-Injurious or Aggressive Behavior" (Docket No. FDA-2016-N-1111) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5179. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices; Exemptions From Premarket Notification: Class II Devices" (Docket No. FDA-2019-N-2686) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5180. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5181. A communication from the Deputy Director of the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of

Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Refuge Alternatives for Underground Coal Mines" (RIN1219-AB84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5182. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Control of Communicable Diseases; Foreign Quarantine: Importation of Human Remains" (RIN0920-AA72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5183. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-07, Introduction" (FAC 2020-07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5184. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-07, Small Entity Compliance Guide" (FAC 2020-07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5185. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-07, Technical Amendments" (FAC 2020-07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5186. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2015-002, Requirements for DD Form 254, Contract Security Classification Specification" (RIN9000-AN40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5187. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2018-004, Increased Micro-Purchase and Simplified Acquisition Thresholds" (RIN9000-AN65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5188. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2017-010, Evaluation Factors for Multiple-Award Contracts" (RIN9000-AN54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5189. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2018-005, Modifications to Cost or Pricing Data Requirements" (RIN9000-AN69) re-

ceived in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5190. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2018-022, Orders Issued via Fax or Electronic Commerce" (RIN9000-AN80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5191. A communication from the Rules Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Video Visiting and Telephone Calls under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act" (RIN1120-AB77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5192. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Home Visits in Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers During COVID-19 National Emergency" (RIN2900-AQ96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2020; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-5193. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Acquisition Regulation: Acquisition of Commercial Items and Simplified Acquisition Procedures" (RIN2900-AP58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 21, 2020; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-5194. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance - Definition of Member's Stillborn Child for Purposes of Coverage" (RIN2900-AQ49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2020; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-5195. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to actions taken during the COVID-19 outbreak to ensure continued service to Veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-5196. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Great Lakes Pilotage Rates - 2020 Annual Review and Revisions to Methodology" (RIN1625-AC56) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0736) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5197. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Upper Potomac River, National Harbor, Maryland" (RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2020-0143) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5198. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Pier 45 Fire Emergency Response and

Marine Debris, San Francisco" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2020-0283) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5199. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Chartier Fireworks, St. Clair River, Michigan" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2020-0375) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5200. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; HMS Medway, St. Johns River, Jacksonville, Florida" (RIN1625-AC56) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0736) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5201. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Highway 99 Partial Bridge Replacement, Stanislaus River, Ripon, California" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0890) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5202. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; San Juan Harbor, San Juan, Puerto Rico" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0460) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5203. A communication from the Acting Chief of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Person in Charge of Fuel Transfers" (RIN1625-AC50) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0493) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5204. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Upper Potomac River, National Harbor, Maryland" (RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2020-0143) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5205. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, Object Removal; Delaware River and Bay, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2020-0344) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5206. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Potomac River, Montgomery County, Maryland" (RIN1625-AA87) (Docket

No. USCG-2017-0448)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5207. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anchorage Grounds; Lower Chesapeake Bay, Cape Charles, Virginia" ((RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2015-1118)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5208. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anchorage Grounds; Lower Mississippi River below Baton Rouge, Louisiana, including South and Southwest Passes; New Orleans, Louisiana" ((RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0991)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5209. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anchorage Grounds; Lower Chesapeake Bay, Cape Charles, Virginia" ((RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2015-1118)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5210. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5211. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5212. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standard for Hand-Held Infant Carriers" (16 CFR Part 1225) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5213. A communication from the Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Leased Commercial Access; Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative" ((MB Docket No. 07-42, and 17-105) (FCC 20-95)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5214. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Policy Statement on Factors Considered in Assessing Civil Monetary Penalties on Small Entities" (Docket No. EP 764) received in the Office of

the President of the Senate on July 22, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Douglas S. Lowrey and ending with Col. James P. Work, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 24, 2020. (minus 37 nominees beginning with Col. Steven L. Allen)

Air Force nomination of Col. Rebecca R. Vernon, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Randall E. Kitchens, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. John B. Morrison, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Laura A. Potter, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Levon E. Cumpton and ending with Col. Edwards S. Little, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Martin M. Clay, Jr. and ending with Col. Michael J. Turley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Farin D. Schwartz, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Gregory P. Chaney and ending with Brig. Gen. Jose J. Reyes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Paul T. Calvert, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Jeffrey A. Kruse, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Scott D. Berrier, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. John C. Andonie and ending with Brig. Gen. William L. Zana, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 1, 2020.

Navy nomination of Capt. Trent R. Demoss, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Tony D. Bauernfeind, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Andrew W. Batten and ending with Col. Mark B. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Leigh G. Johnson, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Chelsea L. Bartoe and ending with Daniel J. Watson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Kelly C. Martin, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Lance M. Gower, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Jennifer M. Kollmar, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Pamela L. Blueford, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Suzanne K. Romeo, to be Major.

Army nomination of Nathaniel S. Sanders, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Ivan Arreguin and ending with Cheun S. Yoo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Army nomination of James C. Birk, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of D013487, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Jeremy J. Mandia, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Yousef H. Abuhakmeh and ending with David B. Zusin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Dante L. Amelotti and ending with Larry L. Zhang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Army nomination of Mark E. Patton, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Chris B. Winter, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Gregorio Ayala, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Victor E. Beitelman and ending with Charles F. Gwynn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Army nomination of Brennan A. Bylsma, to be Major.

Army nomination of Derrick A. Dejon, to be Major.

Army nomination of Bradley C. Hannon, to be Major.

Army nomination of Christen L. Holcombe, to be Major.

Army nomination of Irwin Johnson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Brian J. Mawyer, to be Major.

Army nomination of Shawn M. Pierce, to be Major.

Army nomination of Ericka M. Rostran, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Nicholas D. Hebblethwaite, to be Major.

Army nomination of Steve L. Martinelli, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Peter H. Chapman, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Heidi B. Demarest, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Soraya Goddard, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of David A. A. Awanda, to be Major.

Army nomination of Andrew S. Lohrenz, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Steven J. Ackerson and ending with D015260, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 1, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Ji E. Ahn and ending with G010539, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 1, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Melinda J. Acuna and ending with D011138, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 1, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Talon G. Anderson and ending with D014845, which

nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 1, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Marieclaud C. Bettencourt and ending with Robert S. Vaidya, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Ruffin Brown III and ending with John R. Zillhardt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Timothy N. Aamlund and ending with Donald F. McArthur, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nomination of Julie H. Formby, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Evan Hart and ending with Edward M. Wise, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Jason J. Carpenter and ending with Shane D. Vania, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Jennifer M. Douthwaite and ending with Jeffrey L. Yonke, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nomination of Danielle M. Tack, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Terry L. Clark, Jr. and ending with Bryan V. Stevens, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Laura C. Fahrenbrook and ending with Ismael Rodriguez, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Charles C. Boggs and ending with Karl G. Wagner III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Timothy J. Beluscak II and ending with Jason J. Potts, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with William C. Comstock and ending with Kelly L. Johnson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Alexander L. Ailer and ending with Karlene M. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Lidilia M. Amadorgarcia and ending with Jessica E. W. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Alexandria A. E. Argue and ending with Aidan K. Wolfe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Jason C. S. Adams and ending with D015630, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Gary W. Brown and ending with Kathleen E. Genest, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2020.

Navy nomination of Justin W. Jennings, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Mehdi A. Akacem and ending with James G. Zoulias, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory K. Albaugh and ending with Edward A. Walton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Melanie Evangelista and ending with Scott T. Ozaki, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Charlotte E. Cluverius and ending with Christopher R. Viney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Joe K. Blair II and ending with Brenda K. Shepherd, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nomination of Gustavo Aguilar, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Richard L. Eggers, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Richard H. Schreckengast, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael V. Gomes, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of David A. Schwind, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with John Franco and ending with Mark A. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with John A. Evans and ending with Christopher S. Koprivec, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Patrick A. Bellar and ending with Pratik Ray, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Perry R. Barker and ending with David C. Robinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Amada Y. Avalos and ending with Billy F. Hall, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Uries S. Anderson, Jr. and ending with Riley E. Swinney, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with John R. Belcher and ending with Shayne J. Schumacher, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Jerry N. Belmonte and ending with Richard P. Zabawa, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael K. Allen and ending with Jerry W. Wyrick II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Christian G. Acord and ending with Jeffrey W. Whitsett, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Aaron N. Aaron and ending with Jason M. Wittrock, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Brian F. Breshears and ending with Robert D. T. Wendt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniel M. Bryan and ending with Michael A. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Arlo K. Abrahamson and ending with Tiffani B. Walker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with James C. Bailey and ending with Jason R. Staley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniel J. Bellinghausen and ending with Eric R. Zilberman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Rebecca K. Adams and ending with Marcela C. Zelaya, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Gina M. D. Becker and ending with Anne L. Zack, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Joseph F. Abrutz III and ending with Keith S. Zeuner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Shelley E. Branch and ending with Troy L. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nomination of Ruth E. Cook, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Brent J. Tilseth, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Space Force nomination of Michael S. Hopkins, to be Colonel.

(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 Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules for tribal economic development bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 4334. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the process by which a member of the Armed Forces may be referred for a mental health evaluation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for Mr. MARK KEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR)):

S. 4335. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a policy with respect to family seating on air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 4336. A bill to provide for the improvement of rural infrastructure in the United

States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 4337. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to stop granting immunity subsidies to companies that engage in behavioral advertising, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 4338. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to temporarily suspend increased line speeds at meat and poultry establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. WARREN (for Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN)):

S. 4339. A bill to provide, manufacture, and distribute high quality face masks for every individual in the United States during the COVID-19 emergency using the Defense Production Act and other means; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 4340. A bill to ensure that a State or local jurisdiction is ineligible to receive or use funds allocated, appropriated, or authorized to address COVID-19 if that State or jurisdiction discriminates against religious individuals or religious institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 4341. A bill to establish a Committee on Large-Scale Carbon Management in the National Science and Technology Council and a Federal Carbon Removal Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4342. A bill to establish a National Child Abuse Hotline; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 4343. A bill to direct the Government Accountability Office to evaluate appropriate coverage of assistive technologies provided to patients who experience amputation or live with limb difference; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 4344. A bill to provide a tax credit to live event venues that provided refunds on tickets for events that were cancelled due to the coronavirus pandemic; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 4345. A bill to amend section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to ensure that efforts to engage in espionage or technology transfer are considered in visa issuance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4346. A bill to amend the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to repeal the sunset provision; considered and passed.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 4347. A bill to establish a Coronavirus Rapid Response Federal Labor-Management Task Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 4348. A bill to provide for the conduct of a GAO study and report on rural health access during the COVID-19 pandemic; 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 Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 659. A resolution designating September 2020 as "School Bus Safety Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 660. A resolution honoring and commemorating the life and legacy of Representative John Lewis; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Res. 661. A resolution recognizing the importance of independent living for individuals with disabilities made possible by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and calling for further action to strengthen home and community living for individuals with disabilities; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, Mr. COONS, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 662. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 157

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 157, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit kindergarten through grade 12 educational expenses to be paid from a 529 account.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) 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. 944

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 944, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2233, a bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that requires Federal agencies to share citizenship data.

S. 2238

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2238, a bill to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes.

S. 2434

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2434, a bill to establish

the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 2479

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2479, a bill to provide clarification regarding the common or usual name for bison and compliance with section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2546

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2546, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 2669

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2669, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2898

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2898, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 2903

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2903, a bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, to develop financial risk analyses relating to climate change, and for other purposes.

S. 2975

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2975, a bill to prevent the spread of aquatic invasive species in western waters, and for other purposes.

S. 3064

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3064, a bill to oppose violations of religious freedom in Ukraine by Russia and armed groups commanded by Russia.

S. 3232

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3232, a bill to promote and support the local arts and creative economy in the United States.

S. 3395

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3395, a bill to require consultations on reuniting Korean Americans with family members in North Korea.

S. 3595

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3595, a bill to require a longitudinal study on the impact of COVID-19.

S. 3599

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor 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. 3756

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3756, a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a renewable fuel feedstock reimbursement program.

S. 3814

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 3814, a bill to establish a loan program for businesses affected by COVID-19 and to extend the loan forgiveness period for paycheck protection program loans made to the hardest hit businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 3850

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3850, a bill to require the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to collect and report certain data concerning COVID-19.

S. 3952

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3952, a bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign persons that have engaged in significant theft of trade secrets of United States persons, and for other purposes.

S. 3979

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to temporarily waive cost-sharing amounts under the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program during certain declared emergencies.

S. 4012

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from

Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4012, a bill to establish a \$120,000,000,000 Restaurant Revitalization Fund to provide structured relief to food service or drinking establishments through December 31, 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 4033

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4033, a bill to require States to establish contingency plans for the conduct of elections for Federal office in response to national disasters and emergencies, and for other purposes.

S. 4117

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4117, a bill to provide automatic forgiveness for paycheck protection program loans under \$150,000, and for other purposes.

S. 4129

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 4129, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds.

S. 4150

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4150, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide assistance to certain providers of transportation services affected by the novel coronavirus.

S. 4152

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 4152, a bill to provide for the adjustment or modification by the Secretary of Agriculture of loans for critical rural utility service providers, and for other purposes.

S. 4160

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4160, a bill to enable certain hospitals that were participating in or applied for the drug discount program under section 340B of the Public Health Service Act prior to the COVID-19 public health emergency to temporarily maintain eligibility for such program, and for other purposes.

S. 4167

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4167, a bill to set the interest rate

applicable to certain economic injury disaster loans, and for other purposes.

S. 4172

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4172, a bill to provide emergency funding for child welfare services provided under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4174

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4174, a bill to provide emergency appropriations to the United States Postal Service to cover losses related to the COVID-19 crisis and to direct the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service to develop a plan for ensuring the long term solvency of the Postal Service.

S. 4227

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4227, a bill to improve access to economic injury disaster loans and emergency advances under the CARES Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4284

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4284, a bill to provide for emergency education freedom grants, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 4285

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4285, a bill to establish a pilot program through which the Institute of Museum and Library Services shall allocate funds to States for the provision of Internet-connected devices to libraries.

S. 4299

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 4299, a bill to provide grants for tourism and events support and promotion in areas affected by the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), and for other purposes.

S. 4324

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4324, a bill to facilitate the availability, development, and production of domestic resources to meet national personal protective equipment and ma-

terial needs, and ensure American leadership in advanced research and development and semiconductor manufacturing.

S. RES. 531

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 531, a resolution honoring Las Damas de Blanco, a women-led nonviolent movement in support of freedom and human rights in Cuba, and calling for the release of all political prisoners in Cuba.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4342. A bill to establish a National Child Abuse Hotline; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from Arizona, Senator SINEMA, in introducing legislation to support the operation of a national child abuse hotline. Of all the major national help hotlines, the crisis line for child abuse and neglect, which is currently operated by a national nonprofit, is the only one without a federal authorization and dedicated federal funding. Our bill, the National Child Abuse Help Hotline Act of 2020, would give the Administration for Children and Families the authority to award a grant to a national nonprofit to support a hotline dedicated to the prevention and intervention of child abuse and neglect. The child abuse and neglect crisis happening across the United States has only been exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic.

On average, five children die every day from child abuse and neglect. According to the Department of Health and Human Services' Child Maltreatment Report, which was published in January 2020 and reflects 2018 figures, 678,000 children were victims of maltreatment in 2018 and a heartbreaking 1,770 children died—including three in Maine. These statistics reflect an unfortunate increase in both child fatalities and victims of maltreatment, and is the first increase for the number of victims who suffered maltreatment since 2015.

Access to prevention and intervention services nationwide has only become more critical in the face of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. The current crisis threatens to severely exacerbate child abuse and neglect, and a number of experts predict that child abuse is currently being underreported. In Maine, when schools closed their doors on March 16 and stay-at-home orders went in place, calls to Maine Child and Family Services decreased immediately, falling 32 percent in the first month. Of note, only seven percent of calls were from school personnel, which is a dramatic drop from the 22 percent of teachers and other school staff—more than any other group—who call

in typically to report abuse and neglect.

With stay-at-home orders, school closures, and high unemployment, families are experiencing financial stress, isolation, and new anxieties at the very time when children have less exposure to mandatory reporters—such as teachers, physicians, and coaches—and safe environments where one may normally escape or seek help. In April, Dr. Larry Ricci, a child abuse pediatrician at Spurwink, located in Portland, Maine, said “our sense is that not only is abuse still happening at the same rate it was happening before, in all likelihood it has increased.” Dr. Ricci pointed out that “We’ve known for many years that the abuse rate mirrors the unemployment rate.” And as Michelle Fingerma, Vice President for Childhelp, a national nonprofit and the current operator of the Childhelp National Child Abuse Hotline located in Arizona, details: “There is a wide range of fallout from pandemic anxiety and school shutdowns. There is more abuse already occurring in homes where caregivers are melting down from the stress, children are trapped at home with abusers, schools and daycare are closed, and therapists and other front-line providers are now more difficult to access.”

During a time when children are not going to school, day care, or family resource centers, and, therefore, traditional resources may not be as easily accessible, the Childhelp National Child Abuse Hotline is a resource that is accessible to children and families across the country. The hotline, 1-800-4-A-CHILD, saw call volume increase by 33 percent from February to May. Childhelp's text and online chat platform, which is supported by a \$1 million ACF Innovation Grant that I have advocated for as a member of the Appropriations Committee, experienced a 66 percent increase in outreach since February.

The helpline importantly serves a wide range of individuals in every single state—at-risk children, distressed parents seeking crisis intervention, and concerned individuals who suspect that child abuse may be occurring. In Maine, where one in every 71 children is a victim of abuse, the National Child Abuse Hotline assisted nearly 200 callers in fiscal year 2019. Those in need are connected—either on the phone or by text or online chat—with masters-level social workers who are there to offer confidential crisis intervention and information, literature, and referrals to emergency, social service, and support resources.

The bill we are introducing today would provide a small but meaningful federal investment to protect children across the country—authorizing \$1 million annually for the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) to award a grant to a nonprofit entity to support a 24-hour, national, toll-free telephone hotline that will provide information and assistance to victims of

child abuse or neglect, parents, caregivers, mandated reporters, and other concerned community members. This does not interfere with any state-mandated reporter hotlines and can be a resource for these individuals. In fact, the current operator has more than 80 community partners in just Maine alone.

The helpline's dedication to the prevention and intervention of child abuse and neglect is both successful and well-documented, and more federal support for this resource will improve our ability to reach children of all ages, as well as parents or caregivers in need. During a time when these supports are needed more than ever, I believe the existing infrastructure and experience of the National Child Abuse Hotline should be used. Even with just more outreach and communications, we could better support the needs of children and families during the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic and economic recovery. Action and investment now can help prevent the worst possible outcome—letting children fall through the cracks during an already traumatizing crisis.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to put the welfare of our nation's children at the forefront of our national Covid-19 response and to support the adoption of this important legislation, which will benefit children and families in the age of Covid-19, as well as after this pandemic passes.

Thank you, Mr. President.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEE, and Mrs. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4346. A bill to amend the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to repeal the sunset provision; considered and passed.

S. 4346

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 "Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Permanent Extension Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Conspiracies among competitors to fix prices, rig bids, and allocate markets are categorically and irredeemably anticompetitive and contravene the competition policy of the United States.

(2) Cooperation incentives are important to the efforts of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to prosecute and deter the offenses described in paragraph (1).

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, is to strengthen public and private antitrust enforcement by providing incentives for antitrust violators to cooperate fully with government prosecutors and private litigants through the repeal of the sunset provision of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note).

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISION.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 211 of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is repealed.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REVIVAL AND RESTORATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Sections 212, 213, and 214 of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) as in effect on June 21, 2020, and as amended by the laws described in subparagraph (B), are revived and restored.

(B) LAWS.—The laws described in this subparagraph are:

(i) Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 Extension Act (Public Law 111-30; 123 Stat. 1775).

(ii) The Act entitled "An Act to amend the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to extend the operation of such Act, and for other purposes", approved June 9, 2010 (Public Law 111-90; 124 Stat. 1275).

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 212 of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (6); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) MARKERS AND AGREEMENTS BEFORE SUNSET.—Notwithstanding the repeal under subsection (a), section 211(b) of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply to any person who received a marker or entered into an antitrust leniency agreement on or before June 22, 2020.

(2) MARKERS AND AGREEMENTS AFTER SUNSET.—The repeal under subsection (a) shall apply to any person who received a marker or entered into an antitrust leniency agreement on or after June 23, 2020.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 659—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2020 AS "SCHOOL BUS SAFETY MONTH"

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

S. RES. 659

Whereas, in an average year, on every school day in the United States, approximately 500,000 public and private school buses carry more than 26,000,000 K-12 students to and from school;

Whereas school buses comprise the largest mass transportation fleet in the United States;

Whereas, in an average year, 48 percent of all K-12 students ride a school bus for each of the 180 school days in a year, and school bus operators drive school buses a total of nearly 4,680,000,000 miles;

Whereas the Child Safety Network (referred to in this preamble as the "CSN"), which is celebrating 31 years of public service in the United States, supports the CSN Safe Bus campaign, which is designed to provide the school bus industry with driver training, the latest technology, and free safety and security resources;

Whereas the designation of School Bus Safety Month will allow broadcast and digital media and social networking industries to commit to disseminating public service announcements that are produced to—

(1) provide free resources designed to safeguard children;

(2) recognize school bus operators and professionals; and

(3) encourage the driving public to engage in safer driving behavior near school buses when students board and disembark from school buses;

Whereas key leaders who deserve recognition during School Bus Safety Month and beyond have—

(1) provided security awareness training materials to more than 14,000 public and private school districts;

(2) trained more than 116,800 school bus operators; and

(3) provided more than 163,120 counterterrorism guides to individuals who are key to providing both safety and security for children in the United States; and

Whereas School Bus Safety Month offers the Senate and the people of the United States an opportunity to recognize and thank the school bus operators and the professionals focused on school bus safety and security in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designate September 2020 as "School Bus Safety Month".

SENATE RESOLUTION 660—HONORING AND COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN LEWIS

Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 660

Whereas the Senate mourns the loss of John Lewis, a titan in the struggle for civil rights and equality for all races, and commemorates his life and accomplishments;

Whereas John Lewis was born during the era of Jim Crow in a segregated community in which racism and discrimination ran rampant;

Whereas John Lewis's moral clarity and unwavering commitment to nonviolence

made his first passions preaching and ministry;

Whereas John Lewis fought his first battle against segregation when he was just a teenager, authoring a petition for equal access to his local public library, where African Americans had paid for the construction of the facilities but were banned from checking out books;

Whereas, before his 21st birthday, John Lewis established his commitment to “good trouble” by organizing sit-ins at segregated restaurants and theaters;

Whereas John Lewis helped found the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which advocated for civil disobedience and nonviolent resistance against segregation across the United States, bringing him to the forefront of the struggle of the United States for civil rights;

Whereas John Lewis participated in the 1961 Freedom Rides, which were a series of trips that tested a new desegregation order of interstate transportation facilities and resulted in multiple beatings and the firebombing of the bus that John Lewis was supposed to be riding;

Whereas, at 23 years of age, John Lewis served as the youngest member of the “Big Six”, which planned the 1963 March on Washington, and worked alongside Martin Luther King, Jr., James Farmer, A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, and Whitney Young to advocate for racial equality and justice for all;

Whereas John Lewis courageously led protestors across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, bravely bearing violence from the police to embody the struggle of the United States to live up to its founding ideals of equal justice under the law;

Whereas the bravery of John Lewis during “Bloody Sunday” led Congress to pass, and President Lyndon B. Johnson to sign into law, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), ensuring that African Americans have the right to fully participate in the democratic process in the United States;

Whereas John Lewis faithfully served the city of Atlanta between 1977 and 1981, embodying his election night promise to “bring a sense of ethics and moral courage” to the Atlanta City Council;

Whereas John Lewis faithfully served the 5th congressional district of Georgia in the House of Representatives between 1987 and 2020, serving as the “conscience of the Congress” by continuing his pursuit of justice and truth in the capital of the United States; and

Whereas the Senate commends John Lewis for his life and for embodying the spirit of love and dignity through his unceasing advocacy for reconciliation, justice, and the equality of all mankind: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable John Lewis, a late Member of the House of Representatives; and

(B) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate—

(i) communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives; and

(ii) transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of John Lewis; and

(2) when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable John Lewis.

SENATE RESOLUTION 661—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF INDEPENDENT LIVING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES MADE POSSIBLE BY THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 AND CALLING FOR FURTHER ACTION TO STRENGTHEN HOME AND COMMUNITY LIVING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 661

Whereas, in enacting the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), Congress recognized that “historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem”;

Whereas the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 recognized the rights of individuals with disabilities to fully participate in their communities through independent living, equality of opportunity, and economic self-sufficiency;

Whereas, 30 years after the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and 21 years after the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999), many individuals with disabilities continue to live in segregated institutional settings because of a lack of support services;

Whereas continued instances of segregated institutional settings have hindered the inclusion of individuals with disabilities in communities, schools, and workplaces, undermining the promise of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990;

Whereas people of color with disabilities experience disproportionately greater barriers to service and access;

Whereas, 30 years after the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, some telecommunication, electronic, and information technologies continue to be developed without the goal of full accessibility and inclusion for all people of the United States; and

Whereas, 30 years after the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, many businesses, public and private organizations, transportation systems, and services are still not accessible to all individuals with disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of independent living for individuals with disabilities made possible by the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.);

(2) encourages all people of the United States to celebrate the advancement of inclusion and equality of opportunity made possible by the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990;

(3) pledges to continue to work on a bipartisan basis to identify and address the remaining barriers that undermine the national goals of equality of opportunity, independent living, economic self-sufficiency, and full participation for individuals with disabilities, including by focusing on individuals with disabilities that remain segregated in institutions;

(4) pledges to work with States to improve access to home- and community-based services for individuals with disabilities; and

(5) calls on the Department of Health and Human Services to provide information, resources, and technical assistance regarding home- and community-based services and supports that enable individuals with disabilities to live independently.

SENATE RESOLUTION 662—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK

Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, Mr. COONS, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 662

Whereas the week of April 6, 2020, is National Public Health Week;

Whereas the theme for National Public Health Week in 2020 is “NPHW @ 25: Looking Back, Moving Forward.”;

Whereas the goal of National Public Health Week in 2020 is to recognize the contributions of public health in—

(1) improving the health of the people of the United States; and

(2) achieving health equity;

Whereas, as of the date of introduction of this resolution, the United States and the global community are responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, which requires support for—

(1) a robust public health workforce;

(2) State, territorial, local, and Tribal health departments, health care workers, public health laboratories, and first responders;

(3) diagnostic testing of new and potential COVID-19 cases and activities related to epidemiology and public health data;

(4) complying with appropriate social distancing and quarantine recommendations;

(5) relieving financial burdens for individuals in the United States hurt by the COVID-19 pandemic, including public health emergency leave;

(6) State Medicaid programs and community health centers to ensure care for vulnerable populations;

(7) collaboration between the Federal Government, State and local governments, schools, businesses, and employers to support public health measures to decrease community spread of COVID-19; and

(8) investment in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which support infectious disease outbreak preparedness and critical public health infrastructure for State and local health departments and public health laboratories;

Whereas, in 2018, the life expectancy for the population of the United States slightly increased for the first time in 4 years;

Whereas many of the leading causes of death for individuals in the United States result from chronic conditions, which are among the most common, costly, and preventable of all health challenges;

Whereas there are significant differences in the health status of individuals living in the most healthy States and those living in the least healthy States, including differences in obesity rates, the prevalence of chronic disease, and the prevalence of infectious disease;

Whereas racial and ethnic minority populations in the United States continue to experience disparities in the burden of illness and death, as compared with the entire population of the United States;

Whereas violence is a leading cause of premature death, and it is estimated that more than 7 individuals per hour die a violent death in the United States;

Whereas deaths from homicides cost the economy of the United States billions of dollars, and the violence of homicides can cause social and emotional distress, community trauma, injury, disability, depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder;

Whereas emergency department visits for suicidal thoughts or self-harm increased 25.5 percent between January 2017 and December 2018, with substantial increases occurring in younger age groups;

Whereas an estimated 1 in 7 children in the United States experiences child abuse and neglect, which imposes an annual lifetime economic burden of approximately \$428,000,000,000 on the population of the United States;

Whereas, despite significant progress in reducing the infant mortality rate in the United States to a historic low of 5.8 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in 2017, the infant mortality rate in the United States greatly varies among States;

Whereas women die from pregnancy-related complications in the United States at a higher rate than in many other developed countries, and an estimated 60 percent of maternal deaths in the United States are preventable;

Whereas, although overall drug overdose deaths in the United States decreased 4.1 percent between 2017 and 2018, drug overdose deaths attributed to synthetic opioids, including fentanyl, increased by 10 percent during the same time period;

Whereas cigarette smoking is the leading cause of preventable disease and death in the United States, accounting for more than 480,000 deaths every year, including more than 41,000 deaths resulting from secondhand smoke;

Whereas the percentage of adults in the United States who smoke cigarettes has decreased from 20.9 percent of the population in 2005 to 13.7 percent of the population in 2018;

Whereas, according to data from the National Youth Tobacco Survey, between 2017 and 2019, e-cigarette use—

(1) more than doubled among high school students, rising from 11.7 percent to 27.5 percent; and

(2) tripled among middle school students, rising from 3.3 percent to 10.5 percent;

Whereas, in 2016, fine particulate air pollution led to more than 64,000 premature deaths in the United States, and Black and Hispanic minorities were disproportionately impacted;

Whereas public health organizations use National Public Health Week to educate public policymakers and public health professionals on issues that are important to improving the health of the people of the United States;

Whereas studies show that small strategic investments in disease prevention can result in significant savings in health care costs;

Whereas vaccination is one of the most significant public health achievements in history and has resulted in substantial decreases in—

(1) the number of cases, hospitalizations, and deaths associated with vaccine-preventable diseases; and

(2) health care costs associated with vaccine-preventable diseases;

Whereas each 10 percent increase in local public health spending contributes to a—

(1) 6.9 percent decrease in infant deaths;

(2) 3.2 percent decrease in deaths related to cardiovascular disease;

(3) 1.4 percent decrease in deaths due to diabetes; and

(4) 1.1 percent decrease in cancer-related deaths;

Whereas public health professionals help communities prevent, prepare for, mitigate, and recover from the impact of a full range of health threats, including—

(1) disease outbreaks, such as the COVID-19 pandemic;

(2) natural disasters, such as wildfires, flooding, and severe storms; and

(3) others disasters, including disasters caused by human activity and public health emergencies;

Whereas public health professionals collaborate with partners outside of the health sector, including city planners, transportation officials, education officials, and private sector businesses, recognizing that other sectors can influence health outcomes;

Whereas, in communities across the United States, individuals are changing the way they care for their health by avoiding tobacco use, eating healthier, increasing physical activity, and preventing unintentional injuries at home and in the workplace; and

Whereas efforts to adequately support public health and the prevention of disease and injury can continue to transform a health system focused on treating illness into a health system focused on preventing disease and injury and promoting wellness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week;

(2) recognizes the efforts of public health professionals, the Federal Government, States, Tribes, municipalities, local communities, and individuals in preventing disease and injury;

(3) recognizes the role of public health in—

(A) preventing and responding to infectious disease outbreaks, such as the COVID-19 pandemic;

(B) mitigating short-term and long-term impacts of infectious disease outbreaks on the health and wellness of individuals in the United States;

(C) addressing social and other determinants of health, including health disparities experienced by minority populations; and

(D) improving the overall health of individuals and communities in the United States;

(4) encourages increased efforts and resources to—

(A) improve the health of individuals in the United States; and

(B) make the United States, in 1 generation, the healthiest nation in the world by—

(i) providing greater opportunities to improve community health and prevent disease and injury; and

(ii) strengthening the public health system in the United States; and

(5) encourages the people of the United States to learn about the role of the public health system in improving health across the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during

today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATION, TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION, AND THE INTERNET

The Subcommittee on Communication, Technology, Innovation, and The Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The Subcommittee on Intellectual Property of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 662, submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 662) supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 662) was agreed to.

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

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

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ANTITRUST CRIMINAL PENALTY ENHANCEMENT AND REFORM PERMANENT EXTENSION ACT

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4346, introduced earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4346) to amend the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to repeal the sunset provision.

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

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 4346) was passed, as follows:

S. 4346

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 "Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Permanent Extension Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Conspiracies among competitors to fix prices, rig bids, and allocate markets are categorically and irredeemably anticompetitive and contravene the competition policy of the United States.

(2) Cooperation incentives are important to the efforts of the Antitrust Division of the

Department of Justice to prosecute and deter the offenses described in paragraph (1).

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, is to strengthen public and private antitrust enforcement by providing incentives for antitrust violators to cooperate fully with government prosecutors and private litigants through the repeal of the sunset provision of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note).

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISION.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 211 of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is repealed.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REVIVAL AND RESTORATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Sections 212, 213, and 214 of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) as in effect on June 21, 2020, and as amended by the laws described in subparagraph (B), are revived and restored.

(B) LAWS.—The laws described in this subparagraph are:

(i) Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 Extension Act (Public Law 111-30; 123 Stat. 1775).

(ii) The Act entitled "An Act to amend the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to extend the operation of such Act, and for other purposes", approved June 9, 2010 (Public Law 111-90; 124 Stat. 1275).

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 212 of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (6); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) MARKERS AND AGREEMENTS BEFORE SUNSET.—Notwithstanding the repeal under subsection (a), section 211(b) of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply to any person who received a marker or entered into an antitrust leniency agreement on or before June 22, 2020.

(2) MARKERS AND AGREEMENTS AFTER SUNSET.—The repeal under subsection (a) shall apply to any person who received a marker or entered into an antitrust leniency agreement on or after June 23, 2020.

Mr. CRAMER. 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.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2020

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, July 29; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Kan nomination under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the provisions of S. Res. 660 as a further mark of respect for the late John Lewis, former Congressman for the State of Georgia.

There being no objection, under the previous order and pursuant to S. Res. 660, the Senate, at 6:09 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 29, 2020, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SAM C. BARRETT

IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE PERMANENT GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 716:

To be major general

MAJ. GEN. NINA M. ARMAGNO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE PERMANENT GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 716:

To be major general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM J. LIQUORI, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE PERMANENT GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 716:

To be major general

MAJ. GEN. BRADLEY C. SALTZMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE PERMANENT GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 716:

To be major general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN N. WHITING

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

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. NINA M. ARMAGNO

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

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM J. LIQUORI, JR.

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

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BRADLEY C. SALTZMAN

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

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN N. WHITING

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be colonel

LAURA A. KING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

ISMAEL H. SOTO RIVAS

IN THE ARMY

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

To be colonel

ALEXANDER V. HARLAMOR

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

To be colonel

KEITH A. MCGEE

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

To be colonel

LEROY CARR III

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

To be colonel

CHERRYANN M. JOSEPH

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

To be colonel

WILLIAM H. PUTNAM

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

To be major

DANA M. MURPHY

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 28, 2020:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

DANA T. WADE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

THE JUDICIARY

DAVID CLEVELAND JOSEPH, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.