



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2020

No. 159

Senate

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, we are grateful that You continue to rule the universe. We acknowledge that though wrong seems so strong, Your purposes will be fulfilled.

Lord, we praise You for Your promise that, in everything, You continue to work for the good of those who love You.

Mighty God, let Your will be done. Bless our lawmakers, listen to their prayers, and guide them with Your truth. Quench their thirst for Your presence with Your abiding love. May they not forget the many times You have helped them in the past. We pray in Your gracious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

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

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

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the signing of the Abraham Accords today at the White House represents a very historic breakthrough for peace in the Middle East. I am not saying that this accord alone will bring peace to that troubled region, but this is the

first tangible progress toward peace in that area in a quarter century.

I met Anwar Sadat at the time of the Camp David Accords in 1978, when he was present in the Ways and Means Committee room over in the House of Representatives, and I had an opportunity also to witness, at the White House, the handshake between Rabin and Arafat in 1993. Both events seemed to herald a new peace in the Middle East that, quite frankly, never materialized, and yet we still have peace between Israel and Egypt and between Israel and Jordan.

Israel has been a country for over 72 years. It is the only democracy in the region. It is a major economic, military, and political power, and, of course, it is our greatest ally in the Middle East. It is overdue for other states, then, and those states that are in that area especially to recognize Israel and pursue normal relations.

The outdated notion that recognition of Israel's existence should be withheld until somehow Israelis and Palestinians agree on the details of a two-state solution has not worked. The two-state solution hasn't made an agreement more likely, but it has prevented diplomatic interactions that could be a stabilizing force in an unstable region.

In a polarized time, today's historic accord between Israel and the UAE and Israel and Bahrain is good news that anyone can celebrate. We ought to give President Trump great credit for his leadership in this area. He has delivered in a lot of areas where both Republican and Democratic Presidents could not deliver in the past.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, I discussed a tide of good news flowing out of the Middle East. Peace agreements between Israel and the UAE and Israel and Bahrain will be documented at the White House later today. Even more Arab countries are reportedly considering following suit. The winds of change are blowing across the Middle East. Thanks, in large part, to the hard work of the Trump administration, they are blowing toward peace.

I also mentioned yesterday that not everyone is happy. Not everyone in the Middle East is living in the 21st century. Some are too vested in the old fights and enmities and are afraid to let them go. President Abbas, who is now in the 16th year of a 4-year term at the head of the Palestinian Authority, predictably, tried to dismiss the compromise as nonsense. But, as the Obama administration's Middle East expert Dennis Ross wrote a few days ago, continuing this failed approach would just guarantee Palestinians will be left behind while the rest of the Arab world builds a better future.

And then there is the theocratic basket case that is Iran. Last weekend, as if perfectly scripted to contrast with the hopeful news of optimism and peace coming from the Arab world, the mullahs reminded the whole world of their flagrant disdain for human dignity and basic human rights. They carried out a hurried execution in the face of international condemnation.

Navid Afkari, a 27-year-old Iranian wrestler arrested during a government protest in 2018, was tortured into confessing to the murder of a security guard. He was hanged on Saturday. According to his mother, who was barred from visiting her son before his execution, Navid and his two brothers arrested alongside him were forced to testify against one another. As they mourn their brother, these two young men themselves face decades in prison

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5577

for standing up to the brutal injustices of the Iranian regime.

Stories like this are tragic, but they aren't shocking—not in a country where dissent and free expression are denied and not from rulers who regularly use both domestic and international terrorism. This regime has its fingerprints on destabilizing campaigns, assassinations, and violence against civilians in every single corner of the Middle East—from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Aden.

The Obama-Biden administration's Iran deal, the JCPOA, did not improve any of this bad behavior. It ignored Iran's nonnuclear aggression. It let Tehran continue R&D on enriched uranium. If anything, Iran's behavior has only gotten worse, and that bad deal is still doing damage.

This year, it will sunset a prudent U.N. Security Council resolution that had kept Iran from buying conventional weapons. This summer, the U.N. Security Council, with the votes of Russia and China, refused to extend this 13-year-old embargo.

Returning to the JCPOA has become a sort of mantra for our political left here in the United States. But really, the reflex to oppose everything President Trump does can be a gift to our adversaries. Former Vice President Biden promises to rush back into a bad deal without securing any improvements. He proposes we would be able to renegotiate the bad deal from the inside of it after tossing away any leverage in advance.

There is one right way to deal with regimes like Iran—toughness and resolve. That is why President Trump successfully restored an important measure of deterrence when he removed Iran's top terrorist, Soleimani, from the battlefield forever.

Even though Tehran is weakened by sanctions, political unrest, and economic unease, they are also emboldened by our internal divisions and eager to exploit rifts among our allies. We know from publicly released intelligence that Iran seeks to interfere in our own politics. We know that Iranian-backed groups continue to threaten our forces in Iraq and Syria. We know that Iranian proxies like Hezbollah pose a growing threat to our ally Israel.

Unity, strength and resolve are the way to defend our security and our interests—not capitulation.

PROTESTS

Madam President, now, one final matter. For months now, it has been clear to basically every reasonable American that our country can and must hold two sets of true statements in our minds at the same time.

No. 1, our country has unfinished work to ensure that policing is fair to everyone and that Black Americans do not feel unfairly treated or targeted by law enforcement. And, No. 2, the vast majority of law enforcement officers

are heroes, and the toxicity, anger, and actual violence that far-left mobs have inflicted on police men and women across our country is simply beyond the pale.

The American people want racial justice, and we want good, strong policing to ensure equal protection of the laws. We understand there is no contradiction here—none whatsoever. Most people are outraged by the killings of Black Americans that have shocked our country.

Sunday marked 6 months since the death of Breonna Taylor in my hometown of Louisville, KY. Our people want answers. Our Nation wants answers. Most Americans also feel sick when they hear about events like what happened last weekend in Los Angeles. Two sheriff's deputies were ambushed and shot while they sat in their patrol car in Compton. And then far-left protesters tried to literally block—block—an entrance to the hospital chanting things like “kill the police” and “I hope they [effing] die.”

Fortunately, both deputies are out of surgery, but the hateful climate that creates these acts is still with us. One of our two political parties should do more to repudiate the underlying climate on their side.

To be clear, Democratic leaders, including Vice President Biden and our colleague like the junior Senator from California, spoke up quickly to condemn the actual shootings of these officers themselves. That was absolutely the right thing to do—no question. But what about the underlying climate? For months, the political left in this country has put all its might behind a false narrative that says disorder is acceptable, riots are free speech, and law enforcement is the real enemy of certain communities.

One prominent national newspaper, which found a straightforward op-ed from our colleague, Senator COTTON, to be more than they could bear, had no problem publishing a submission entitled, “Yes, We Mean Literally Abolish the Police.” No problem publishing that—“Yes, We Mean Literally Abolish the Police.”

When the Speaker of the House was asked to respond to rioters illegally toppling statues across the country, she blithely responded: “People will do what they will do.” That was about the topic of statues. From one liberal big city to another, we have seen mayors and local leaders who apparently find it easier to propose cutting police funding and criticize their men and women in uniform than to denounce out-of-control riots in their very own cities.

Just yesterday, with this Los Angeles story making headlines nationwide, the junior Senator from Massachusetts decided to criticize police officers on his Twitter feed and proposed a nationwide ban on nonlethal measures like tear gas and rubber bullets—a nationwide ban on nonlethal measures like tear gas and rubber bullets.

We are now at a point where some of our Democratic colleagues survey the

Nation, survey the way law enforcement officers are being treated, and decide the answer is to keep rhetorically throwing cops under the bus—throwing them under the bus—and try to ban their nonlethal means of self-defense while they are at it.

The American people don't have any trouble rejecting terrible racism and discrimination and rejecting lawlessness, violence, and anti-police prejudice with equal clarity and equal force. They deserve leaders who can do likewise.

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 Mark C. Scarsi, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to finish my remarks before the vote begins.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, after the Senate Republicans spent 4 months dithering and delaying, last week, Leader MCCONNELL pushed a partisan, emaciated COVID bill. It was so paltry and laden with poison pills that it was clearly designed to fail. And fail it did.

It is time for the Senate Republicans to wake up to the gravity of the crisis in our country and work with Democrats on a comprehensive bill that delivers real help to Americans.

Speaker PELOSI and I have already come down \$1 trillion from our initial

request. Leader McCONNELL and Senate Republicans must drop the cynical and political games and instead work with Democrats to find common ground and reach a compromise.

If Republican leadership lets the 20 Members of their caucus who barely want to provide any more relief and allows them to dictate their party's agenda, it will block the path to a compromise, and Republicans will have to answer to the American people.

Our country still does not have a strong grasp on COVID-19. America continues to lead the world in the number of confirmed cases by far—over 6.5 million. Nearly 200,000 Americans have died. Yet, unthinkable, it was reported that in one of his interviews with Bob Woodward, President Trump said that “nothing more could have been done” to combat the coronavirus. “Nothing more could have been done”—that is what President Trump said. Of the many lies the President has told about COVID-19, this is one of the most monumental and one of the most galling.

There were so many vital things the President could have done to fight COVID-19 and protect our country. In the early days of the virus, hospitals, medical centers, and essential workers were short on PPE, ventilators, swabs, masks, and gloves. President Trump never mobilized the resources of the Federal Government, never fully invoked the Defense Production Act, and never set up a national clearing house to get resources where they needed to go.

It has been 7 months and President Trump still doesn't have a national testing strategy. There has never been a national plan for contact tracing. The President took months before he even encouraged Americans to wear a mask. This is an entire universe of actions that President Trump could have taken to help slow the spread of the virus and save American lives and American jobs, but he didn't. He never took strong action, never took responsibility. It is what it is.

In many cases, it would have been better, actually, if the President did nothing instead of what he did. It would have been better if the President never downplayed the virus, never called it a hoax, never pushed quack medicines, never speculated about injecting bleach, and never held rallies.

Every week—every week—brings new evidence that his administration is totally unequipped to right the ship, especially the Department of Health and Human Services. Over the weekend, there were numerous reports that political appointees at HHS have been interfering with CDC's report on COVID-19, trying to delay, edit out, or halt the release of facts that would have been politically embarrassing to the President. This is not the first time the administration has tried to hide reports and facts that would better inform the American people.

Meanwhile, as that is happening, President Trump has pressured HHS to

“slow the testing down.” He has overstated the benefits of certain treatments and pressured the FDA to approve them and accused FDA officials of holding back a vaccine, and too many people within HHS are trying to suppress the science.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services, Alex Azar, has not only failed to push back against these outrageous moves by President Trump, but he has been almost entirely silent about the chaos and mismanagement in his own agency.

In Trump's administration, the most important skill is the ability to stand up to the President and resist political influence—more so in an agency like HHS than others, where the health of Americans is at stake.

It has become abundantly clear that the leadership of the Department of Health and Human Services has allowed perhaps the most important Federal agency right now to become subservient to the President's daily whims.

So, today, I am calling on Secretary Azar to resign immediately. We need a Secretary of Health and Human Services who will look out for the American people, not President Trump's political interests.

WILDFIRES

Madam President, now on another topic, wildfires: For the last several weeks, much of the American West has been ravaged by a historic wave of wildfires. At least 35 people have been killed. Thousands of homes have been destroyed. Over 5 million acres of land have been incinerated, roughly the size of Rhode Island and Connecticut combined. The sky glows with ghastly shades of red and orange.

It is impossible to have a serious conversation about these wildfires without talking about climate change. We know that climate change contributes to the frequency of these fires. We know it accelerates their destructive power. Six of the 20 largest fires in California history have happened this year alone. Heat waves and dry air make these disasters more likely.

These past few years have been some of the hottest and driest on record, but at a press conference yesterday with FEMA and California State officials, President Trump brushed aside any possibility that climate change had an effect, suggesting idiotically that the planet will “start getting cooler; you just watch.”

This is just like what he did with COVID. He tries to deny it, and he makes it worse. He encourages people to ignore it, and the problem grows.

When the head of the California Natural Resources Agency told the President that science disagreed with him, the President said: “I don't think science knows.” This exchange where the President said “It'll start getting cooler; you just watch,” when he was upbraided by a scientific expert and says “I don't think science knows” captures everything you need to know

about President Trump's grasp of basic scientific facts—and especially the science of climate change.

Without a shred of evidence or knowledge, President Trump said that our planet will just “start getting cooler.” It is just like his attitude toward this pandemic, which he promised would magically disappear.

You would think the situation would be better here in Congress, but, regrettably, the Republican Senate doesn't seem to take the threat of climate change seriously either. The Republican majority has had 6 years in charge of the Senate to show that they want to make progress on climate change but have done next to nothing—next to nothing—to curb emissions or protect our environment from the damaging effects of a warming planet.

The only time Republicans even brought up climate change legislation was when Leader McCONNELL scheduled a sham vote on a climate bill so his own Members could vote against it. That is right. The only climate bill Leader McCONNELL has brought to the floor is a bill he wanted his Members to vote against.

Democrats, on the other hand, believe protecting our planet is a moral obligation. Senate Democrats created the first-ever Senate special committee to study the climate crisis. We have committed to creating clean energy jobs and building resiliency in any infrastructure bill.

I have introduced legislation called Clean Cars for America that would make all vehicles on the road carbon-neutral by 2040, and we have committed to creating at least 10 million new clean energy jobs and dedicating 40 percent of climate funding to environmental justice and the disadvantaged and communities of color.

Just last week, I joined with Senator MARKEY and many grassroots organizations to introduce the THRIVE resolution, calling for millions of new jobs in renewable energy and making new investments in Black, Hispanic, and indigenous communities so that clean air, clean water, and clean energy are not privileges for the wealthy few but abundant for all.

This is about protecting our planet so that our kids and grandkids can live in a world with clean air, clean water, and the same kinds of opportunities we grew up with.

Republicans have had 6 years in the Senate to show they are serious about the defining crisis of our time, something that, over the years, will be even worse than COVID—much worse—and they have failed to take any action, just like they did on COVID: no action. Democrats would not make the same mistake again. We will not delay on climate the way Republicans have delayed on COVID and not done what is needed.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON SCARSI NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Scarsi nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Hawley	Roberts
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Jones	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Lankford	Smith
Cornyn	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Duckworth	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Moran	Van Hollen
Enzi	Murkowski	Warner
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Perdue	Young
Gardner	Peters	

NAYS—12

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schatz
Booker	Markey	Schumer
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Capito	Cramer	Sanders
Coons	Harris	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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 Stanley Blumenfeld, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Tom Cotton, John Cornyn, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, Lamar Alexander, John Thune, Steve Daines, James Lankford.

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 Stanley Blumenfeld, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), 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 89, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Hawley	Roberts
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blunt	Hoeven	Rosen
Booker	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Boozman	Inhofe	Rubio
Braun	Johnson	Sasse
Brown	Jones	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cardin	King	Scott (SC)
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Lankford	Shelby
Cassidy	Leahy	Sinema
Collins	Lee	Smith
Cornyn	Loeffler	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Sullivan
Cotton	McConnell	Tester
Crapo	McSally	Thune
Cruz	Menendez	Tillis
Daines	Merkley	Toomey
Duckworth	Moran	Udall
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wicker
Feinstein	Paul	Wyden
Fischer	Perdue	Young
Gardner	Peters	

NAYS—6

Blumenthal	Hirono	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Markey	Warren

NOT VOTING—5

Capito	Cramer	Sanders
Coons	Harris	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 89, the nays are 6.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stanley Blumenfeld, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last week, Leader MCCONNELL called up a bill to the floor of the U.S. Senate. It was a coronavirus relief bill, which included a number of components that both sides had agreed needed to be in any coronavirus relief bill. It was a targeted bill. It was a fiscally responsible bill, and it was a bill that was rooted in reality. In other words, there was a belief that it could be signed into law if, in fact, it was passed by the Congress.

So, when it was called up, obviously, we talked about the features in the bill, many of which are things, as I said, enjoyed bipartisan support. When I said it was fiscally responsible, it actually repurposed funds from the previous coronavirus relief bill, from the CARES Act, that had not yet been spent. So it took some of those dollars, repurposed them, used them in another way, which I think would be a fiscally responsible way in which to approach the whole issue of how we spend taxpayer dollars on any issue, including a crisis. So there was a repurposing that I think, again, represents a fiscally responsible approach to doing this.

It also addressed the issue of people who were unemployed. It had a provision in there that allowed people to continue to receive unemployment insurance above and beyond what their States offered in terms of the benefits—\$300 above that on a per-week basis, which, on average, represents about an 85-percent wage replacement. So it was about an 85-percent wage replacement in terms of an unemployment benefit. It also included bipartisan improvements and bipartisan amendments and modifications to the PPP program, things which both sides had agreed upon. That program has been very successful but needed to be expanded and reauthorized, so it included those changes—again, bipartisan changes.

It included significant funding for both elementary and secondary education—about \$70 billion there to help our schools open safely and another \$30 billion to \$35 billion for colleges and universities for the same purpose: to help them be able to open safely—again, a bipartisan priority.

Those are just a few of the things that were included. It also included, of course, additional funding for vaccines, therapies, testing, all things that we think are vitally important if we are going to defeat the virus.

Those were all components that were included in the bill last week that was brought up to the floor by the majority

leader, Senator McCONNELL, and it was blocked. It was filibustered by the Democrats. Now, when I say blocked, I am not talking about blocking the end bill. I am talking about blocking even getting on the bill. It was a motion to proceed under the Senate rules, something that is necessary to get on a bill.

It is important, I think, to point out that there are several ways in which a bill can be stopped, and they require a supermajority—60 votes in the Senate. Once you are on a bill and it is subject to an amendment process, you can, at the end of that, if you don't like the bill, you can still block it with 41 votes. In other words, it takes 60 votes to get on a bill, to proceed to a bill, and 60 votes to get off the bill, to report it out. So there are several places where if you are opposed to something and you think that you haven't been treated fairly, you can block it.

But blocking the motion to proceed means you are blocking a bill—even just the idea of getting on the bill and opening it up to an amendment process and debating it on the floor of the Senate. That is not, obviously, the first time that has happened. It happened in the police reform bill. It happened earlier this year in the original CARES package.

But on the police reform bill, you had, again, a bill that had many bipartisan provisions in it. In fact, about 75 to 80 percent of the bill were things that both sides agreed upon, and, there again, the motion to proceed just to get on the bill was blocked. It was by the use of the filibuster. It was by the use of the 60-vote threshold in the Senate to prevent the Senate from even proceeding to the bill—even after, I would add, the manager of that bill and the author of that bill, Senator TIM SCOTT from South Carolina, had indicated through the leadership that they would be willing to accept up to 10 amendments or up to 20 amendments. They were offered unanimous consent to get 10 or 20 amendments offered in the police reform bill, but it was still blocked even on the motion to proceed by the Democrats in the Senate.

So, when they blocked the bill last week, it was pointed out, I think, accurately by the media reporting on the bill. These were a few of the headlines to give you a sense of the reaction.

The Hill: "Senate Democrats block GOP relief bill." The Washington Post said: "Democrats block slimmed-down GOP coronavirus relief bill. . . ." ABC News said: "Democrats block Senate GOP COVID 19 relief proposal." National Public Radio said: "Senate Democrats Block GOP's \$300 Billion Pandemic Relief Bill."

So those were some of the headlines. Maybe this doesn't mean anything to anybody but Congress watchers, but I am sure the irony is not lost on anybody who follows this process. The Democrats used the legislative filibuster. When I say blocking a motion to proceed, it was the use of a legislative filibuster to block a bill last

week—as I mentioned, several times earlier this year—at the same time that they are calling for an end to the legislative filibuster.

Imagine that. Think about the irony of that. On Friday, NBC News reported: "Democratic insiders are assembling a coalition behind the scenes to wage an all-out war on the Senate filibuster in bullish anticipation of sweeping the 2020 election. . . ."

So the very mechanism that they used repeatedly here just in the last year—but, frankly, for the last 6 years that they have been in the minority—to block or, in some cases, even to improve a bill that comes to the floor of the U.S. Senate, they are now talking about getting rid of that very rule. I mean, think about that. The irony of that is pretty rich.

It was a disturbing confirmation that the campaign by some Democrats to eliminate the Senate's nearly 200-year-old practice for considering legislation has become official. It used to be sort of whispered around here and talked about, but now they are talking openly about getting rid of the filibuster. It puts into stark contrast the choice the voters are going to face in November.

So what is the legislative filibuster? Well, it is the product of the Senate's tradition of unlimited debate. The legislative filibuster is essentially the requirement that 60 Senators agree before the Senate can end debate and vote on a contentious bill. In other words, you need 60 percent of the Senate to agree before you can pass a bill.

Now, what this means in practice is that unlike the House of Representatives, where legislation can easily pass with the support of just one party, in the Senate, you generally need the support of at least some Members of the other party before you can pass legislation. Nowadays, the Senate's filibuster rule could be said to be the primary thing that distinguishes the Senate from the House of Representatives.

That matters because the Senate is supposed to be different from the House of Representatives. The Framers of the Constitution designed the Senate to be, as the minority leader once said—aluding to the legendary exchange between Washington and Jefferson—the cooling saucer of democracy.

Wary of—to quote Federalist 62—"the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies, to yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions," the Founders created the Senate as a check on the House of Representatives. They made the Senate smaller and Senators' terms of office longer with the intention of creating a more stable, more thoughtful, and more deliberative legislative body to check ill-considered or intemperate legislation.

As time has gone on, the legislative filibuster is the Senate rule that has had perhaps the greatest impact in preserving the Founders' vision of the Senate. Thanks to the filibuster, it is often harder to get legislation through the Senate than through the House. It

requires more thought, more debate, and greater consensus.

Those are good things. Historically, Senators of both parties have recognized this. They have seen beyond the narrow partisan advantage of the moment and fought for the preservation of the filibuster.

In 2005, when there was talk of abolishing the judicial filibuster, Democratic Senators, some of whom still serve in this body today, fought fiercely to safeguard it. At a rally in March of that year, the current Democratic leader said:

They believe if you get 51% of the vote, there should be one party rule. We will stand in their way! Because an America of checks and balances is the America we love. It's the America the Founding Fathers created. It's been the America that has kept us successful for 200 years and we're not going to let them change it! . . . We will fight, and we will preserve the Constitution.

That is from the current Democratic leader back in 2005, speaking about proposals to eliminate the filibuster. Well, unfortunately, the Democrats changed their tune a few years later when they thought abolishing the judicial filibuster would serve their advantage. But even then, Democrats—and later Republicans—sought to distinguish between confirming nominees and the importance of preserving debate on legislation. Now they are talking about abolishing the fundamental practice of the Senate, the legislative filibuster, for the same prospect of temporary partisan gaming.

"Nothing's off the table," the minority leader said when asked about Democrats' intentions for the legislative filibuster if they win back the Senate. It is a far cry from what he said just a few years ago.

Eliminating the legislative filibuster would permanently change the nature of the Senate. The cooling saucer that the Founders envisioned would essentially be gone, and the one-party rule the Democratic leader decried back in 2005 would become a reality.

Some might ask why one-party rule is a problem. After all, sometimes one party wins the Senate, the House, and the Presidency. Shouldn't that party be able to pass whatever legislation it wants? Well, the answer is no. Our country is relatively evenly split down the middle, with the advantage sometimes moving to the Republicans and sometimes to the Democrats, but even if one party were a permanent minority in this country, one-party rule still wouldn't be acceptable.

Let me go back to the Federalist papers for just a minute. Federalist 10 and 51 discuss two issues that the Founders were concerned about: minority rights and the tyranny of the majority. While we tend to think of tyrants as single individuals, the Founders recognized that a majority could be tyrannical as well. So the Founders created a system of government designed to prevent tyrannical majority from running roughshod over the rights of the minority, and one of those checks was the Senate.

Today, the legislative filibuster may be the single most important thing preserving the Senate's constitutional role as a check on majority tyranny. By requiring 60 votes, the filibuster ensures that any legislation has to take into account the views of a broad group of Senators. With a 60-vote threshold, you are unlikely to get your legislation passed unless you bring some Senators of the opposite party on board, and that means the minority party has a real role in shaping legislation in the Senate, something the minority party in the House lacks.

Democrats have repeatedly, as I pointed out earlier, used the legislative filibuster to their advantage during this Congress. In March, Democrats filibustered our largest coronavirus relief bill, the CARES Act, until Republicans agreed to add some Democratic priorities, and Democrats quickly took credit for making the bill better. You would think that Democrats would want to preserve this influence, especially—especially—now that Democrats have experienced the consequences of their decision to abolish the judicial filibuster.

Of course, when they say they want to abolish the legislative filibuster, Democrats mean that they want to abolish the legislative filibuster if they win a majority in November. They have a lot of legislation they want to pass, and they don't want to have to moderate that legislation to address Republicans' or Americans' concerns.

But I would remind my colleagues that no one is in power forever. If Democrats do win in November and abolish the legislative filibuster, they may quickly come to regret that decision once they are in the minority again, because no matter how permanent a majority thinks it will be, sooner or later every majority party returns to minority status.

In addition to doing away with the bipartisan nature of the Senate, ending the legislative filibuster would also erode the stability of government. Legislation would become more partisan because the majority would not have to take into account the opinions of the minority party. That would make legislation likely to be reversed as soon as the opposite party gains the majority in a future Congress.

Without the legislative filibuster, it is not hard to see a future in which national policy on a host of issues could fluctuate wildly every few years. Taxes could go up and down on a regular basis. Government programs could be stopped and started every few years. The consequences for individuals, businesses, and our economy would not just be unpleasant but potentially devastating.

I understand the frustration of my Democratic colleagues. I have been in the minority of the Senate. I was in the minority my first 8 years here.

I also know what it is like when you get into the majority and can't pass everything you want because the minor-

ity party will filibuster your bills. I have certainly had moments when I wished we could just pass legislation with a simple majority, especially coming from the House of Representatives.

Democrats have stood in the way of a lot of legislation I would like to have passed this year, from Senator SCOTT's police reform bill, which I mentioned earlier, to additional coronavirus relief, to pro-life legislation.

It is also important to note that not every filibuster has been undertaken for noble purposes. Like every tool, it can be misused. But I know that no matter how frustrating the filibuster may be in the moment, preserving it is essential to preserving the institution of the Senate and the purpose for which it was created. It is essential to protecting minority rights, and it is an essential check on tyrannical majorities that would seek to curtail our freedoms.

Legend has it that when Benjamin Franklin was leaving the Constitutional Convention, someone asked him what form of government the convention had instituted. "A republic," Franklin said, "if you can keep it"—"if you can keep it."

Today, the legislative filibuster is the key rule preserving the Senate's constitutional role as a check on partisan passion. I pray that no future Senate will destroy the Senate's essential role in our system of government for temporary partisan gain.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. THUNE. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to just start by saying amen to everything the Senator has said.

I listened to his words carefully, and I hear a great deal of caution in his words about actions that the Senate may take as a body that would be in response to perhaps short-term gain or immediate political gain—but a gain that could be finite.

Over the course of the years that I have been in the Senate, I, too, have shared the same frustration about legislation that I cared deeply about that I believe had been blocked. Our parliamentary rules have actually worked to delay things unnecessarily or oftentimes delayed things to the point where they never came to fruition. I have seen the frustration. I also see the benefit of being more methodical, of being that cooling saucer in the process of governance and particularly good governance.

But the words that you used are very, very cautionary. It is as if you are suggesting that if we change the filibuster rules, we will, in effect, have changed the institution of the Senate going forward and have changed the institution so that it is, perhaps, just a smaller body than the House but subject to the same rules, where those who have the most votes on one side win.

My question to the Senator from South Dakota is, Do you believe that a change in the filibuster rules here in the U.S. Senate would be permanently detrimental to the institution of the Senate going forward?

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would say, through the Chair, to my colleague from Alaska that that is absolutely the case. I don't think there is any question but that, if the legislative filibuster is done away with in a future Senate—and, again, Members on the Democratic side are talking openly about doing that if they gain the majority after the election in November—it will transform the institution of the Senate and, by extension, transform our country.

The institution that was designed to protect minority rights and to put a check on a majority will no longer be a functioning institution in the way the Founders intended. In fact, it will essentially become, as the Senator from Alaska pointed out, the House of Representatives with longer terms.

I think that would be unfortunate for a country that was based upon a system of checks and balances and that recognized very early on how critical it was that minority rights be a part of our public debate and discussion and that those voices not be muffled or that those voices not be completely put out of the public debate.

I would simply say to my colleague from Alaska that I think this is a monumental issue in terms of what this institution has meant to this country and what it will continue to mean in the future if these rules are changed and this constitutional protection, as we have pointed out, is done away with. It will transform the Senate, and it will transform the country in ways that would be very detrimental to what the Founders intended.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

I would hope that on a matter as significant as what we are talking about, which is effectively the operational integrity of this institution, there would be good, thorough open discussion and debate on this floor and amongst floor Members.

But the concerns we are hearing that there are efforts on the outside of this body that would push us to change our rules and do so in a way that could permanently erode and undercut the ability of the U.S. Senate to operate as intended would be, I believe, a travesty.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened to this debate very carefully because I have great respect for both of the Senators—the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from South Dakota.

I have seen both of them operate as effective legislators on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I have seen both of them entertain amendments, both friendly and not so friendly, on the floor of the

Senate and deal with them in a fair fashion. I have seen both of them use the U.S. Senate to achieve legislative goals, some that I shared and some that I didn't share.

But I have to ask them, in all candor, as I listened to the speech about preserving the Senate as we know it, if they are really taking a look around at the Senate as we know it. Do you know how many amendments were debated on the floor of the U.S. Senate in the year 2019—in the entire year? America's greatest deliberative body considered 22 amendments in that year. Six of them were offered by one Senator—Senator RAND PAUL, the junior Senator from Kentucky. You remember them, as I do. He basically said: Here is a gun to your head. If you want to go home, I get a vote. He got his vote. And as he reminded me, he lost every one of those amendments. So 6 of the 22 amendments were, frankly, one Senator's effort to have a recorded vote, and that is all it was.

Sixteen substantive amendments in a year, and you are arguing that we cannot change the Senate, we cannot transform the Senate, we cannot consider changes to the rules of the Senate. I know better.

I know that you are a good legislator, and you are as well, Senator. I know that you can take a bill through a committee, bring it to the floor, defend it on the floor, and go through the amendment process. We all know that that is how the Senate was designed to work.

What happened? What happened to the Senate? Well, if you take a look at the number of cloture motions to end a filibuster that were filed some 13 years ago, they averaged about 68 a year. Do you know how many we now have? Over 250 a year.

This is out of control. It is so much out of control that when you take a look at the ordinary business of the U.S. Senate and you take a look at the memories you may have of passing a budget resolution, we don't do that anymore, do we? You take a look at passing appropriation bills. You remember sitting on the Appropriations Committee and proud to be there, as I am too. I loved that committee. It was a great committee to serve on. We actually took agencies and went through hearings and drew up budgets and took them to Appropriations subcommittees and actually considered amendments in the committee and then brought them to the floor and had amendments on the floor. Yes, that happened in your political lifetime and in mine. It no longer occurs. Do you understand the Senate which you are defending is a Senate which no longer engages in that kind of debate?

What does it boil down to? There were meetings of the Big 4 or the Big 8, or whatever number there happens to be. They decide all 12 appropriations bills, and we sit on the outside of the room holding our hands patiently, hoping that something we wanted is in-

cluded. Is that the Senate that you ran for? Is that the Senate you do not want to change? Tell me seriously. It can't be.

Those of us on this side of the aisle say to younger Members: You would have loved the Senate if you just could have seen it, but you have only been here 6 years. So you missed it.

There was a time when we did debate on the floor. Do you remember when Dodd-Frank came to the floor? Senator Dodd and Senator SHELBY were managing that bill. This was the most dramatic change in Wall Street policy in a generation or more. I remember it because I offered what I believe was the 25th amendment on the floor—25 amendments on this bill that had already come out of the Banking Committee. I offered the 25th amendment on debit cards, and they announced that it would be a 60-vote margin. All the others had been a simple majority to that point. I surprised everybody, including myself, and passed that amendment. And then more were offered.

Do you remember the immigration reform bill? Do you recall what happened there? I can tell you because I was on the Gang of 8 that wrote the bill. We went through the Judiciary Committee, and Senator Jeff Sessions of Alabama was determined to derail the bill. He said: I have dozens of amendments, and I am going to offer them all. Well, he stopped at about 20 because he wasn't passing most of his amendments. Then it came to the floor, and we faced the same amendment process, amendment after amendment, and the bill was passed on the floor of the Senate.

That was within my political lifetime and yours as well. It worked. Why is it not working now? Why is this such an empty Chamber? Why are there all of these empty desks when there are so many things that need to be done in America? Because we have stopped legislating. We have stopped debating. We have stopped amending.

You say: Boy, we have to preserve this. We have to do everything we can to preserve this.

We know better than that. This is not the Senate that we are witnessing. This is some aberration, some use of the filibuster.

In the first 3 years, with Senator MCCONNELL in charge, we had more filibusters and cloture votes than in the entire history of the U.S. Senate. It is out of control, my friends, my colleagues, fellow Senators.

It is out of control, my friends, my colleagues, my fellow Senators. I don't know what the answer is in terms of rule changes, but I will tell you this.

Mr. THUNE. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. In just one moment.

I will tell you this: To argue that we need to preserve this is to really discourage anyone from becoming a Member of this body if we are not going to legislate, if we are not going to tackle the real issues of our time.

I look at the Presiding Officer. He stepped up on the last immigration debate that we had on a bipartisan measure. I thank him for doing it. It wasn't easy, politically. That was what the Senate once was not that long ago.

I do yield for a question.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois agree, however—because I think it is important to point out that this is not something that happened in the last few years. The Senator from Alaska had a colleague elected in 2008 who, when he ran again for election in 2014, the argument could be made against him that he had never gotten a vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate on a single amendment in a 6-year term in the Senate.

I came here in 2005. In the first 8 years that I was here as a Senator, I witnessed time and again the very thing you are talking about, where amendments were shut down, the tree was filled, in the parliamentary language that we use here in the Senate.

So I would ask the Senator: Is this not a—this is not an issue that has cropped up in the last few years. Is this not a problem that originated some time ago and, as the Senator is suggesting, that we need to do away with the supermajority requirement that requires us here as Senators to work together in a bipartisan way to find common ground to fix what ails the Senate?

I would argue and a lot would argue that what ails the Senate right now requires nothing more than behavioral change. We have to agree that when somebody offers an amendment on one side, that it is not going to be blocked immediately and we get into this lockdown. That is what happened in recent years and in the last couple of examples we have had, as recently as last week, blocking the motion to proceed to the bill.

I mean, if you want to have an amendment process, you have to get on the bill in the first place. That has been, now, the routine that has been executed by the minority, is to prevent even a motion to proceed, which would enable us to get to an amendment process.

So this is not something that happened when Senator MCCONNELL came; this was happening well before that. As I pointed out, the Senator from Alaska's colleague went through an entire 6-year term without getting a vote—a Democratic colleague—when he was in the majority here in the Senate.

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from South Dakota, thank you. I said earlier, and I meant it—I think you are a good legislator, as are the Senator from Alaska and many others, and given a chance, you prove it. We just don't get the chance anymore. No budget resolution. No appropriations bills. One bill, really, of any substance comes to the floor of the Senate each year now. It is the Defense authorization bill, by tradition. Come hell or high water, we are going to bring up

that bill. And I am glad we do, but that is it. End of story. The rest of the time, what do we spend our days doing? Watching the clock go by for 30 hours so we can have a vote on the next nomination. Is that the Senate you ran for? Is that why you went through the sacrifice and asked your family to join you in that sacrifice to be in public life? No. Not for me, it isn't. I am here to do something. I think we can do something. We have proven it in the past.

The Affordable Care Act. Books will be written—they have already been written about what it took to finally pass it, but eventually it was enacted into law and signed by the President and changed the lives of millions of Americans. I am glad I voted for it. It was not a bipartisan effort at any stage. I wish it were.

The point I am getting to is this: I don't know what the answer is in terms of changing the rules, but I am not going to stand in defense of the status quo. I do not believe the notion that we cannot touch the Senate and its traditions really is defensible in light of what we have seen on the Senate floor for the last several years—years.

I just have to tell you, I am surprised now that the Republican position articulated by your leader and by the whip is status quo: Leave it as is. It is fine. It is just great. Don't you change the Senate.

Well, I think the Senate needs to change.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have one last question for the Senator from Illinois.

I don't disagree that, again, we can do a better job—both sides—of making the Senate a more open place where we have an opportunity to debate, which I think is the history and tradition of the Senate, but I don't think blowing up the Senate rules accomplishes that.

I just want to read for you from this morning—I was on the floor here, but in an interview on NPR, the junior Senator from Massachusetts was asked if there are parts of the Green New Deal that might attract bipartisan support. How did he reply? He replied that we need to enact the whole thing, and if Republicans disagree, Democrats should eliminate the filibuster.

Now, wanting to preserve the filibuster doesn't mean we can't reform the Senate, but it does mean that we shouldn't allow a majority to steamroll a minority. That is what the filibuster and the rules of the Senate were designed to protect.

What your Members are talking openly about doing—including your leader—is nuking the filibuster, blowing up the Senate, and changing and transforming it in a way that will transform not only the Senate and the way the government, I think, was designed to work by our Founders but also transform the country.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would love the junior Senator from Massachusetts to address that question him-

self when he gets his chance on the floor.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. DURBIN. Happy to yield.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, to follow the Senator from South Dakota's comments about using the tool that would effectively blow up the Senate, if you will—these are not words that we use freely, but I think it is fair to suggest that utilizing this tool that would eliminate the filibuster, that would eliminate, really, the strongest tool for a minority party, is akin to the nuclear option. We use that term around here in legislative prose.

I would agree with much of what you have said. You and I have served on the Appropriations Committee now for years. We have had an opportunity to be engaged in good, substantive debates that have yielded good, substantive, enduring laws.

As I think about our role around here, it is not just to engage in the partisan message of the day; it is actually to enact laws. But when we enact laws that are good for just one party, that are wholly partisan, you can kind of predict the direction that will be taken when that minority party that voted against that particular policy then regains power and takes the majority and then attempts to overturn whatever that policy may be.

When we think about ways that we can help an economy that is struggling right now, one of the things that I am hearing from businesses is this: The one thing we would really like out of Washington, DC, the one thing we would really like is some level of certainty with policies, that it is not kind of this whiplash, back and forth from one administration to the next.

Well, the way you do that is through a level of consensus. As we know, on this floor right now, where it is still pretty quiet, consensus has been harder and harder to achieve on a bipartisan basis. Maybe this is a place in time where we are, and it is just dark. As our friend John McCain would say: It is always darkest before it goes pitch-black. Well, maybe we are getting close to the pitch-black. One can only hope.

But I do hear your words that the status quo is not acceptable. I agree with you, my friend. It is not acceptable. It is not acceptable that we are in that place where we can't get votes on amendments that are legitimate and pertinent to the legislation that we have.

I am trying to advance an energy bill right now, to get to final passage, and we are going through the procedural hurdles. I will work through those. But we are at a point where, as an institution, I believe we are failing. We are failing the American public. We are failing our constituents. We are failing in our role in governing.

I do think that when people look to the anxiety that is at play right now with our national elections, with a

Presidential election that is as volatile as we have seen, if there is some level of comfort and security that they might have, they might think that just maybe the Congress, maybe the Senate, can get its act together and be working together.

So I hear you. The status quo is not acceptable. I am not one who is going to say we can't change any of the rules, but we have to do better. Whether it is behavioral attitudes that need to change or whether we need to work together to change the rules, that is where we should be, not unilaterally bomb-throwing, not unilaterally making the decision that is going to benefit our party today, and then when we lose the majority, we will deal with it later. We owe it to the Senate and we owe it to the country to do better.

I appreciate this back-and-forth today. I would welcome other colleagues to join us. I would hope that we look very, very closely at where we are right now because we are using our own rules to do damage to the institution of the Senate.

So let's not take the last tool that holds us in check—this filibuster—and throw it away as well because we will regret it. In the meantime, let's figure out what we can be doing as Democrats and Republicans to do better for the institution of the Senate and do better for the American people.

I apologize. That wasn't by way of a question; it was occupying the time of the Senator from Illinois. But I think we have a lot of work to do here, and I hope we are able to do it together.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, with her permission, I will add a question mark to the end of that statement to the Senator from Alaska, to thank her and warn her that we are coming dangerously close to debating on the floor of the Senate. It almost never happens, and we are coming close to it.

We are actually asking one another: Do we have to change the rules to finally make the Senate work, or is there another way? I am open to other ways. I am open to demonstrations of that. But I will tell you, it is a frustration. It is the determination to make certain that, for the people of Illinois who returned me to the Senate, we actually do something, achieve something; that we go home, win or lose, with the feeling that we have been engaged in a process that respected our rights as individual Senators and ended in a vote up or down and a measure passed or failed. That, to me, is why I ran for this job, and I think probably for yourself as well. We are not there, and we are not close to being there.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, to date, we have lost nearly 200,000 Americans to the coronavirus, and we are quickly approaching 7 million cases in the United States.

This virus has changed life as we know it, and Americans are in need of help from Congress. However, despite

the urgent needs of families, businesses, workers, and unemployed Americans across the country, Senate Republicans have dragged their feet and offered up only a few weak measures that barely address the needs of the Nation.

The majority leader knows what needs to be done. The playbook is right in front of us. We did it back in March with the CARES Act, which passed 96-0.

To negotiate a real package with real solutions for the American people, he needs to show up at the negotiating table and give up these rogue attempts to pass empty, half-hearted measures.

In the meantime, more data is coming in every day, giving us a clearer picture of just how devastating this pandemic has been to so many Americans. A new report from the Robert Wood Wood Foundation found some troubling outcomes that COVID has had on Chicago residents. Half of Chicago households reported facing serious financial problems during the pandemic and troubles caring for children, with 35 percent reporting that they used up all or most of their savings.

As we know, the pandemic has disproportionately affected our minority communities, with nearly 70 percent of Black and 63 percent of Latinx households in Chicago reported having serious financial problems. And I am sad to say that this study found half of Chicago households report having lost their jobs, been furloughed, or seen reductions in wages or work hours since the start of the pandemic.

We all know how important an internet connection is during this pandemic. According to the report, 40 percent of Chicago households are either struggling with their internet connection or lack access to high-speed internet in their home needed to complete schoolwork or their jobs.

While these statistics reflect the reality of many in Chicago, there is little doubt that this is also the story in so many cities and States across the Nation. This is why we need a substantial federal response. We need to do what is necessary to help struggling families, businesses, cities, and States get back on their feet.

Last week, Senate Republicans proposed another inadequate, partisan coronavirus response bill that failed to prioritize the needs of struggling Americans. The bill failed to provide another round of economic impact payments for families or hazard pay for essential workers.

It failed to provide relief to States and local governments so they can continue to pay teachers, EMTs, and firefighters. And it failed to provide any housing assistance or nutrition assistance so struggling families can keep a roof over their heads and food on the table.

It has been 4 months since the House passed the HEROES Act, and week after week Senate Republicans refuse to make a good faith, bipartisan effort

to pass a relief measure that meets the severity of this crisis. History will judge us on how we responded to the worst pandemic in a century and the deepest recession in 75 years. In response to this crisis, did we help prevent millions from slipping into poverty through another round of economic impact payments and extending enhanced unemployment benefits? Did we give schools and teachers the appropriate resources so they can help our children learn in a safe environment?

What steps did we take to preserve one of our country's greatest assets: the health and safety of our workforce? Did we throw caution to the wind by prematurely reopening simply because it's an election year?

Our country needs help, and the proposal that we voted on last week offered little help to struggling Americans.

Our Nation is suffering right now, and there is a long road to recovery ahead of us. Unfortunately, Leader MCCONNELL wasted precious time by pitching a half-baked proposal that prioritized the needs of corporations over the needs of American families.

Let's pass a bill that matches the gravity of this crisis, and let's pass it now.

I will close with a brief comment on substance. On March 26 we shocked America in the Senate. I know it. I went home, and they told me so. Do you know how we shocked them? By a vote of 96 to 0, we passed the CARES Act—96 to 0—with not a single dissenting vote in the Senate—\$3 trillion to address our economic problems and the coronavirus epidemic we were facing. We did it on March 26—yes, in this calendar year—and we did it knowing that the measures we were taking had a life expectancy of just a few months because we thought that would be the end of our challenge. It is not.

The challenges that we faced in passing the CARES Act in March still are challenges America faces. When it comes to COVID-19, the numbers are sobering. The infection rate of COVID-19 in the United States is double the infection rate of the same virus in Canada—Canada. How can the United States be in a position where twice as many Americans are getting sick as those living just on the other side of the border?

When you look at the overall numbers, you have to shake your head. We have 4½ percent of the world's population living in the United States—4½ percent—and over 20 percent of the COVID-19 deaths in the world—4½ percent and 20 percent. What is going on here?

In this Nation, this great Nation, with all of its wealth and all of its resources and all of its talent and all of its great hospitals and doctors and pharmaceutical companies, we have a rate of COVID-19 deaths that is just indefensible.

So I would say to my colleagues: When Senator MCCONNELL came to the

floor and said “Here is our package; take it or leave it,” that is not how this can possibly end. That is not the way the debate ended on March 26. It ended when Senator MCCONNELL and his House Republican counterpart, Congressman MCCARTHY, met with Speaker PELOSI, Leader SCHUMER, and Treasury Secretary Mnuchin in a room and worked it out. That is what it takes.

We need to return to that now and get it done before we leave for any reason—election or whatever it may be. There is no excuse. There are too many unemployed people desperate to get by. There are too many businesses desperate to survive. There are too many tests that we cannot take in America because we haven't invested in the resources. There are too many school districts telling me: Senator, reopening safely for these kids and teachers is going to take some money. Can you help?

There is an election coming up November 3, where election authorities—because people want to vote in the safety of their homes—will receive a dramatic increase in paper ballots cast, and they need a helping hand in processing them in an orderly, honest way.

The demands are out there. State and local governments are in trouble. Small towns in Southern Illinois—I speak to their mayors, and I hear the same things that I hear from the mayor of Chicago: We have had a downturn in revenues; we are going to have to lay off policemen and firefighters and healthcare workers if you don't give us a helping hand.

We cannot walk away from this. Senator MCCONNELL can't take the position of “my way or the highway.” We have to work on a bipartisan basis to negotiate an answer to this, and I hope we do soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to address the Senate for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are fast approaching nearly 200,000 deaths from the coronavirus. But the moral and physical injury done to our country during the pandemic will never be contained in just one number. As that number continues to climb, so too do the frustration and the pain and the outrage of the American people.

We know that Donald Trump recognized the threat of the coronavirus and deliberately downplayed it for his own political gain. He is in large part responsible for these deaths.

We now have 31 million workers who have either received or applied for unemployment benefits. Since March 15, Massachusetts alone has seen more than 2 million claims to our unemployment programs. In Massachusetts, we have the highest unemployment rate in the United States.

Families across the country are facing devastating choices. Cities and towns are struggling to keep programs running and employees at work. We know the Republicans recognize these threats, and they are choosing to ignore them. They are, in part, responsible for the suffering.

After 4 months of callous calculations, when they chose to respond, the Republicans put out on the floor a coronavirus package that was insulting to Americans who have been awaiting relief. The extent of the misery facing our families is unimaginable. Yet Republicans and Leader MCCONNELL responded by designing a bill so intentionally weak and insufficient that it was destined to fail.

It is all just a game to the Republican Party, but for Americans, this economic and public health crisis is a matter of life and death. We need a robust, comprehensive response right now that matches the scale of this crisis, and we have an opportunity to deliver some real justice to working Americans and their families.

First, we need to give Americans a monthly cash payment of \$2,000 so that they have the funding to be able to pay their bills. A single check is not sufficient for households. Families need more than just one payment.

Providing recurring monthly payments is the most direct and efficient mechanism for delivering economic relief to those most vulnerable, for lower income families, immigrant families, and our gig and service workers.

I see these families suffering today. They are the same kinds of working families I grew up with in Malden. I know that \$2,000 each month would mean the world to them—so that they can sleep at night; they can pay the rent; they can pay the electricity bill; they can buy the medications they need.

A monthly payment is the kind of big policy that provides relief on the scale that is needed. Our government needs to tell our families: We are here for you. We will not let you down during this crisis.

Second, we need at least \$4 billion for my E-rate Program to connect every student to the internet at home. The pandemic has shown a bright light on the homework gap being experienced by the 16 million students in this country who do not have internet access at home and are unable to complete their homework. This is unconscionable and a threat to our country's future.

We cannot allow this homework gap to become a larger learning gap, which ultimately is going to become an opportunity gap for these young people. Research shows that the homework gap affects students in both rural and urban areas and disproportionately affects lower income students and students of color. Trump and the Republicans are blocking this investment in education, but we can't let them. We will not leave these students behind.

Third, we need to extend unemployment insurance, the weekly \$600 ben-

efit, through January of 2021. This is not just a line in the budget; it is a lifeline for workers who cannot go to work through no fault of their own. This crisis will be solved only by investing in workers. We cannot simply cut them off when we know harder days lie ahead for those workers in our country.

Fourth, we must continue a national evictions moratorium and provide \$100 billion in emergency rental assistance. No one should have to suffer the indignity of being escorted out of their home by the police. A country that allows evictions during a pandemic—because of a pandemic—has failed its people.

The same goes for electricity and energy shutoffs. We need a national moratorium that keeps the lights on, ensures drinking water, ensures that wastewater services aren't disconnected or interrupted during the emergency period due to nonpayment. We cannot cast families into the dark as they are struggling to stay afloat.

It is wrong to allow a pandemic that has not been created by these families to result in catastrophic conditions that will look like the Great Depression in terms of their impact on families in the same way that it impacted my family during the Great Depression. We owe these people more. They have worked hard. They have worked constantly throughout their lives. Now, through no fault of their own, the pandemic has hit them, and they are unemployed.

Finally, we need \$1 trillion in funding for State and local governments so that our teachers, nurses, postal workers, and other dedicated public servants are not laid off—the essential workers who drive the buses, pick up the garbage, fight the deadliest of fires, educate our young people. Despite providing the services we rely upon every day—including every single one of us in this Chamber—our municipalities are aren't getting any money because Republicans refuse to provide it. State and local governments have been pushed to the brink to support their residents and are in desperate need of relief.

To my Republican colleagues I say that this funding isn't blue or red; it is green. And all of our mayors and Governors and city councilors—whether Republican or Democrat—need that money right now.

I have been traveling around my home State of Massachusetts talking to families. They tell me the same thing: They want a livable future for their children. That means they need the government to do its job effectively in managing this COVID-19 pandemic. Instead of making excuses, they need a government that works on solutions, even if the problems are unprecedented, and they want that government to recognize the rights and dignity of everyone.

Our families want something so basic and so simple, they almost shouldn't

have to say it: They want their children to dream about the future instead of fearing about the future.

They need political leadership from us right now—not political games, not the political calculation of just 20 Members of the Senate Republican caucus.

To my colleagues I say that the gravity of this crisis requires us to respond right now. We know we have a President in the White House who is irresponsible. The President knew. It turns out he knew the virus was deadly. He knew it as well as we knew it, but he lied to us. He told us it would magically disappear. He said it was no worse than the flu while on tape we hear him say that it is lethal. On February 10, he said: You know, a lot of people think it goes away in April with the heat, when the heat comes in. That is what the President said in February about the coronavirus.

He also tells us that climate change is a myth. He tells us that our planet is not in grave danger. He makes fun of the science of climate change the way he makes fun of wearing a mask.

Now the "Denier in Chief" says when it gets cooler it will go away, that the fires in the west coast will just go away. His answer to coronavirus is that when it gets warmer, it will go away. When he deals with the science of climate change, he says: When it gets cooler, the fires will go away.

The west coast of the United States is on fire, and 10 percent of Oregon is under evacuation order. A warning—that is half a million people. We have dozens of wildfires burning right now in California, including the largest in the history of that State. It has blotted out the sun for hundreds and hundreds of miles. The Southwest is shrouded in a horrifying, constant twilight.

We can keep looking at these things in isolation, as if somehow or other they are not connected. Each fiery conflagration, each hurricane, each devastating flood, each ungodly windstorm that wipes out a whole year of crops—we can say they have nothing to do with each other or we can look at the truth and listen to the science and say enough is enough.

We can lie to ourselves and say, as Trump does, that one day these things will just "magically disappear," depending upon whether the heat or cooling will solve the problem. But we all know better. We know that unless we act now, the fires will happen annually and burn hotter and larger each summer, each fall in our country. We know that the hurricanes will get worse and more frequent. Two made landfall at once this year. We know that they will disrupt and destroy the economies of the gulf and the eastern seaboard.

How many times can we ask our people to rebuild? We know that midwestern floods will grow each year, drowning out a whole way of life and making refugees of our farmers. We know that the windstorms like those this year will continue to destroy

crops. Iowa lost 43 percent of its corn and soybeans this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. No, it will not magically disappear. We need a Green New Deal. We need a solution that matches the magnitude of the problem.

I yield back to the Presiding Officer. I appreciate his indulgence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks before the lunch recess.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, let me say that I join my friend from Massachusetts in a desire to see us take up and pass another COVID-19 relief bill. I would say that so far, the House of Representatives has taken a completely unrealistic approach, including many non-COVID-19 relief provisions in the bill, including tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. They literally include, in the COVID-19 bill they call the Heroes Act, a tax cut by removing the cap on deductibility on State and local taxes on your Federal income tax.

When we did that in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we felt it was improper to force States like the Presiding Officer's and mine to subsidize the irresponsible spending practices in major cities like New York and San Francisco.

If our Democratic friends are indeed serious about wanting to get a deal, we are open, certainly, to negotiating a deal, just as we did the first four bills that we passed, especially by unanimous vote.

It seems the closer we get to the election, which is now 49 days out, that the old partisan dysfunction begins to creep back in and you hear speeches like the Senator from Massachusetts just gave, advocating things like the Green New Deal as a solution to all the world's problems. It is just completely pie in the sky and a pipedream that is obviously not going anywhere.

That doesn't stop our friends across the aisle blaming this side of the aisle or the President for everything that happens in the world, including hurricanes and forest fires, which are largely as a result of failing to undertake proper forest management that we know can prevent fires. They blame it on climate change. It is an easy argument claiming science is on their side.

We need to be good stewards about our environment, no doubt about it. I have no doubt the climate is changing and humans contribute to that, but there are smarter and better ways for us to approach it other than eliminating jobs and burdening people on fixed incomes with higher electricity and energy costs and just embracing an ideological solution, which is no solution at all and will create more problems than it solves.

I would just say, finally, on this point, that we know that the guidance

from the Centers for Disease Control has evolved over time. I went back and checked. My friend in Massachusetts says the President did this; he did that; he said this; he didn't do this. I remember going back and looking at the Centers for Disease Control guidance before April. They said masks were ineffective; they didn't do anything. They came back after some additional investigation and research and said: Well, they can help. That is why we are all wearing masks, especially when we can't socially distance.

Looking at this pandemic now in September as opposed to the way it looked in March, we have learned a lot, thank goodness. Our medical professionals have saved a lot of lives. We learned how to mitigate the risks. We learned how to live with the virus at the same time we are investing heavily in therapies and a vaccine, which can't come soon enough.

Senate Republicans have made attempt after attempt to deliver another round of coronavirus relief to the American people. In July, we proposed the HEALS Act, which was a starting point for negotiations. We realized this wasn't the end-all and be-all any more than the Democrats' Heroes Act, this \$3 trillion hodgepodge of an ideological wish list that we knew wasn't going to pass, but we knew we needed to start somewhere.

Speaker PELOSI didn't help when she quickly disparaged our starting proposal as "pathetic." And, of course, Senator SCHUMER, the minority leader in the Senate, called it "unworkable." I guess they thought they finished their job, and they dismissed it outright and did nothing to negotiate in good faith toward a resolution. They simply have no interest in amending the bill or trying to find a common ground. They just stiff-armed it.

This August, when we attempted to narrow the scope of the negotiation to the most urgent matters—things like continuing Federal unemployment benefits, which expired at the end of July—this time our Democratic colleagues rejected what they called a "piecemeal" approach. Never mind the fact that the House returned to Washington to pass a bill only to help the Postal Service, which was actually bipartisan. Apparently, that kind of piecemeal is acceptable as long as it is a Democratic-sponsored and authored bill.

That brings us to September. Last week, we gave it another shot. The majority leader brought the bill to the floor to address some of the most pressing challenges facing the American people: funding schools, vaccine research, more testing, unemployment benefits, helping small businesses, again, through the extension of the Paycheck Protection Program—all of which should be and I believe, in truth, are bipartisan goals.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues couldn't resist that old temptation of partisan dysfunction this close

to the election. They pulled out the same playbook they used all summer. Once again, they refused to engage in any meaningful negotiations. They resorted to name-calling and blocked the bill from even being debated. You can't pass a bill unless you are willing to start considering it, but they weren't willing to even do that.

Here we are battling a pandemic, which has claimed more than 190,000 Americans, and Democrats blocked every attempt to pass a piece of legislation since March. Rather than trying to negotiate or amend these bills or reach a bipartisan compromise, they seem to be content with airing their grievances at press conferences.

I agree with one thing the Senator from Massachusetts said: There are people who are hurting and need help. We should not take some perverse delight in exacerbating that pain or noting that pain and being unwilling to do anything to relieve it.

This may be a political game for some of our colleagues. It may be a way to try to score points against the President or try to gain advantage in the runup to the election on November 3, but I assure you, it is not an honest attempt to try to solve a problem; it is not a genuine attempt to try to provide relief to the American people who are hurting; and it is not moving us any closer to defeating this virus once and for all.

In the bills we passed so far—again, on a bipartisan basis, largely unanimously—we provided unprecedented support for American families, including direct payments, bolstered unemployment benefits, and provided the ability to defer student loan payments. We sent help to farmers, ranchers, and producers. We helped our schools prepare for the new school year and gave small businesses and their employees the resources to stay afloat. We have provided stability for families and communities across Texas and across the Nation.

More help is needed, especially to bolster our response to the virus itself. We know we are in a global race to develop a vaccine and treatment. Our brightest scientific minds are working 24/7 to deliver those lifesaving drugs to the world as quickly as we can, safely and effectively, but they need more money to succeed.

At the same time, our communities are trying to test as many people as they can, whether it is people attending college football games or surveillance testing in communities or at colleges or grade schools. Our constituents don't care about our partisan disagreements. They just want us to do everything we can to help them and to help us defeat this virus.

During the month of August, I was able to travel around the State and to listen to feedback from my constituents on how the funding we provided so far has aided in the fight against COVID-19. Congress has provided more than \$234 billion to support our

healthcare response. That includes \$10 billion for research and development of a vaccine through Operation Warp Speed, \$16 billion for personal protective equipment, \$26 billion for testing, and, of course, the \$173 billion Provider Relief Fund to help our hospitals.

More than 23,000 hospitals and healthcare providers in my State alone have received more than \$5.1 billion in Federal funding, allowing them to procure critical resources like masks and gloves and to cover mounting costs due to the deferral of elective procedures.

In August, I had a chance to personally thank some of the healthcare workers in Abilene, Waco, Wichita Falls, Amarillo, Lubbock, and Corpus Christi. I also had lunch and visited with the children of healthcare workers in the Rio Grande Valley who, even at such a young age, are amazed by the heroic work of their parents.

As our war against this virus carries on, we need to ensure that our frontline workers and healthcare providers have the resources they need to sustain this fight.

I also visited with the Family Health Center in Waco, which is 1 of 73 federally qualified health centers in Texas operating more than 500 sites. This is really a critical part of our healthcare safety net in my State and across the Nation.

I have always been a strong supporter of our community health centers and cofounded the Senate Community Health Centers Caucus several years ago. As I said, these facilities make quality healthcare a reality for so many Texans, whether they have Medicare, Medicaid, private insurance, or no insurance. Texans can go to these health centers and receive the care they need when they need it.

The particular Family Health Center I visited in Waco was founded more than 50 years ago to address a shortage of doctors and primary care access for low-income patients and has since grown to 15 clinics across McLennan County, which provide not only primary and preventive care but dental and behavioral healthcare too.

As Family Health Center CEO, Dr. Jackson Griggs, said community-oriented primary care is difficult in any era, and it has been uniquely challenging during COVID-19. Unexpected operating costs and lost revenue created serious financial hardship, but because of the \$3 million in the CARES Act and other Federal funding they got, they have continued to provide quality healthcare during this time of critical need. Because of Federal funding, they have been able to test every person who comes in with symptoms. They received the equipment, the kits, the mobile computer systems, tents, and the air-conditioning units that allows staff to test patients outdoors, even during a hot Texas summer.

During our visit, Dr. Griggs told me they conducted more than 7,400 tests, with over 1,500 patients testing positive. Of those, 53 percent were unin-

ured. Without legislation passed by Congress, who knows what these patients would have been able to afford or even get access to a COVID-19 test. This funding has also provided more than 187,000 pieces of PPE to the Family Health Center's doctors, nurses, dentists, social workers, and staff who are trying to stay safe and healthy while they continue to care for their patients.

On top of that, the funds have provided the information technology infrastructure to get telehealth services started in record time and nearly 11,000 hours of paid leave for healthcare workers and other staff members who become ill or need to quarantine because of the virus.

The legislation we passed has also helped community health centers, hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and healthcare facilities throughout the State continue to serve their communities.

As we keep working to deliver the assistance for the American people, we need to continue to support our healthcare response. This means ensuring that the providers continue to have the resources needed to operate throughout this crisis. It means more resources for testing and contact tracing to stop the spread. It means an even greater investment in the race to discover a vaccine and treatment so we can finally bring this crisis to an end. It means continuing to provide healthcare coverage for those who are laid off or furloughed or lost employer coverage.

I recently introduced a bill with my friend Senator MCSALLY from Arizona to provide some degree of certainty for folks who found themselves without a job or health coverage through no fault of their own. It is called the Continuous Health Coverage for Workers Act, which would provide premium assistance for COBRA coverage during the rest of the year. As the coronavirus has wreaked havoc on our job market, it has filled countless Texans' lives with uncertainty. By passing this legislation as part of the next relief bill, we can ensure that those who previously maintained their health coverage through their employer can continue to do so through the end of the year.

Let me just say in conclusion that COVID-19 is not a partisan issue. It hasn't been up until this point. Unfortunately, the wheels came off, at least for the time being. We need to put those wheels back on the car. We are all on the same team fighting a common enemy. I hope we can rediscover the sense of bipartisanship and common purpose that helped us pass four bills up through and including March.

During August, I was able to spend time speaking with countless of my constituents about the bills we had passed and discussing what more was needed. In addition to hearing from the healthcare workers and providers who had been on the frontlines, I also joined students and teachers for socially

distanced conversations about the challenges that had been brought on by the start of the new school year. I held a video call with restaurant owners about the ongoing impact of the pandemic on their businesses. On telephone townhalls, I heard from constituents about their struggles to make ends meet after they lost their jobs and then lost the extra \$600 a week in Federal unemployment benefits, which lapsed because our colleagues wouldn't allow us to take up and consider, at some level, a continuation of those enhanced benefits.

As our Democratic colleagues have continued to play games, these are the folks who have been hurt, and I am sure there are similar situations in each of their States. For these Texans whom I have described, COVID-19 isn't about political points or sound bites—it is about their health, their families' safety, and their livelihoods.

While it seems like some have yielded to the temptation of using this pandemic for political gain, I am committed to continuing to work with all of our colleagues who are willing to ensure that we don't lose any of the ground we have gained in the war against COVID-19. We are literally up against the clock, and enough time has been wasted on name-calling, finger-pointing, and political posturing. It is time for the games to end so that we can finally provide our constituents, including our frontline heroes, with the resources they need in order to sustain and win this fight.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KENNEDY).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON BLUMENFELD NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired on the Blumenfeld nomination.

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), 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 92, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Ex.]

YEAS—92

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

NAYS—4

Blumenthal	Markey
Gillibrand	Warren

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Harris
Coons	Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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 assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, Tim Scott, Steve Daines.

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 John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Schatz
Cardin	Jones	Scott (FL)
Carper	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cassidy	King	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Sinema
Cornyn	Leahy	Smith
Cortez Masto	Lee	Stabenow
Cotton	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cramer	Manchin	Tester
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Cruz	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Menendez	Toomey
Duckworth	Moran	Udall
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Feinstein	Perdue	Wyden
Fischer	Peters	Young

NAYS—13

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Booker	Markey	Warren
Cantwell	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hirono	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Harris
Coons	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 13.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomi-

nation of Todd Wallace Robinson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, Tim Scott, Steve Daines.

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 Todd Wallace Robinson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), 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 83, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Jones	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Lankford	Smith
Cornyn	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Tester
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

NAYS—13

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Booker	Markey	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hirono	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Harris
Coons	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 13.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, of California,

to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1508

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request.

“We hope they die.” “We hope they die.” “We hope they die.”

These are the vile words that anti-police protesters yelled on Saturday night, outside St. Francis Medical Center, in Los Angeles County, CA. They were yelling that about two deputy sheriffs, who, at the time, were clinging to life inside the hospital. They were clinging to life, just barely, because, earlier that night, those two deputy sheriffs were brutally ambushed by a gunman, who shot them multiple times as they sat in their patrol car while they were simply doing their jobs of patrolling the local train station.

One of the deputies is a 31-year-old mother of a 6-year-old boy. The other deputy is a 24-year-old man. Both joined the force about 14 months ago. The female deputy was shot through the jaw, but, heroically, she still managed to radio for help and apply a tourniquet to her partner's wounds.

What happened to these deputies in Los Angeles was horrific and dangerous. It is a reminder that, every single day, law enforcement officers put on a badge and then risk their lives to protect all of us—and I mean every single day.

Just this past Sunday, a police officer in Lancaster, PA, responded to a domestic violence call. It came from a home in the city. His body cam video captured what happened next. When the officer arrived, a full-grown man, wielding a huge carving knife and waving it over his head, came charging out of the house and charged straight at the officer. The man who did this, as it happens, is scheduled to go on trial in October on charges of stabbing four people last year.

What happened to the deputies in Los Angeles is not only horrific but is part of a disturbing trend of violence against police. According to the FBI, 37 law enforcement officials have been intentionally killed in the line of duty so far this year. That is a 23-percent increase from the same period last year. Rioters have attacked law enforcement. We have seen them hurling bricks and rocks and other dangerous objects. We have seen them ram them with their vehicles and set police cars on fire.

This violence against police is not happening in a vacuum. It is not. In recent months, the Nation has been engaged in an important, substantive debate about the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve and protect. I happen to think the debate is important. It is one of the reasons I supported Senator TIM SCOTT's bill—to provide more accountability and transparency with respect to law enforcement.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues blocked us from even being

able to hold a debate on that bill. Senator SCOTT and the Republicans were willing to allow votes on any Democratic amendments. They could have changed the bill in any way they had seen fit if they could have made the case with their amendments, but they refused to even have a process—they refused to even allow anyone, including themselves, to offer amendments. They refused to let us even consider the bill.

The police reform debate has exposed some radical voices. Unfortunately, that sometimes includes government officials who spew anti-police rhetoric. They call for defunding—sometimes even for abolishing—the police, and they want to bail out rioters in Minneapolis.

For example, after the two Los Angeles deputy sheriffs were shot on Saturday, not only did anti-police protesters yell “We hope they die” and other vile things outside the hospital, but the city manager of Lynwood, CA—the very city where the deputies were clinging to their lives in the hospital—the city manager responded to the shooting by posting on social media a message saying “Chickens come home to roost.” Can you imagine?

Well, protesters feed off the failure of elected officials to support and defend the police. In Lancaster, after that knife-wielding man was shot by an officer who was just protecting his own life, which was obviously under serious risk, protesters came out and started rioting—throwing bricks, rocks, and bottles at police, smashing windows at a police station and a post office, setting a dumpster on fire—despite the fact that the video clearly shows that the officer was being attacked. He was simply defending his life. I have no idea why anyone would protest a police officer defending his own life.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, a local Democratic elected official in Delaware County recently posted an image—unbelievable—on social media of two Black men holding guns to the head of a White police officer with a caption that said “Does it have to come to this to make them stop murdering and terrorizing us?” What kind of message is that?

As the Los Angeles County sheriff noted on Saturday—after his officers were shot, he said: “Words have consequences.” They do.

You know, instead of defunding the police, we should be defending the police—defending them against this kind of violence both in word and especially in deed. That is why I am here today, calling on the Senate to pass my Thin Blue Line Act today.

My bill sends a very simple and clear message: Anyone who murders a law enforcement official should be prepared to pay the ultimate price. Under Federal law, killing a Federal law enforcement official is an aggravating factor for the Federal jury to weigh when considering whether to impose the death penalty on a cop killer, but that consideration does not apply when a State

or local law enforcement officer is killed. So the Thin Blue Line Act provides that same level of justice to State and local law enforcement officers that we already apply to Federal law enforcement officers by also making the killing of a local law enforcement officer an aggravating factor in determining whether to impose the death penalty in a Federal case.

In 2017, the House passed this bill with bipartisan support, including support of liberals like ADAM SCHIFF and Beto O'Rourke. The bill has very broad support from law enforcement groups, as you might imagine, including from the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Association of Police Organizations, and others.

The Thin Blue Line Act is common-sense, bipartisan legislation that the Senate should pass now. Our law enforcement officers put themselves in harm's way every day, and we are reminded of that every day. They are out there protecting us, and I am not sure that has ever been more dangerous for law enforcement than it is today. We need to do our part to support them, to send a message to them that we support them but to send a message to criminals and potential assassins that they will pay the ultimate price.

In the tragic event that a police officer is killed in the line of duty, we owe that officer justice, and I am going to keep fighting for them to receive it.

So, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1508 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, thank you for the recognition.

As a former New Mexico attorney general and assistant U.S. attorney, I have worked hard to prosecute violent crimes. I have been privileged to work with law enforcement, and we are all thankful for the tremendous work the Capitol Police do here in our Nation's Capital.

The recent shootings of two sheriff's deputies in California was heinous. Our prayers go out to the officers and their families. The perpetrator must be brought to justice. But I do not support rushing through this bill in response to the California shootings.

Under California law, murder of a law enforcement officer already makes someone eligible for the death penalty. This bill needlessly expands the Federal death penalty.

As I understand this bill, for someone to be eligible for the death penalty, he

or she would have to first be convicted of Federal murder, and then it would need to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the victim was killed or targeted because he or she was a law enforcement officer.

I also want to point out that the death penalty itself has widespread issues and many instances of misapplication. DNA testing and other science have proven that innocent people have been executed. The Innocence Project has found that 21 of 375 individuals who were falsely convicted and exonerated by DNA testing since 1989 had served time on death row.

The death penalty has also been applied in a racially discriminatory way. A 1990 GAO report on capital sentencing noted that 82 percent of studies conducted between 1972 and 1990 found that the race of the victim influenced whether a capital murder charge was brought or a death sentence imposed.

As Justice Breyer has noted, “The factors that most clearly ought to affect application of the death penalty, namely, comparative egregiousness of the crime, often do not. Instead, circumstances that ought not to affect application of the death penalty, such as race, gender or geography, often do.” That is in a recent Supreme Court case here in 2015.

I also understand that this bill has not been through the regular order in the Judiciary Committee. It is important that legislation that would have serious consequences is fully examined by the Judiciary Committee, the committee of jurisdiction here.

I would also like to take this opportunity to call attention to key legislation that addresses violence and should come to the floor, and that is the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

VAWA authorization expired over a year and a half ago, on February 15, 2019. Funding continues, but key improvements are being delayed by lack of reauthorization.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019 is supported by all 47 Democratic Senators. The House passed the bill 263 to 158. Thirty-three House Republicans voted yes on that bill. This bill would extend VAWA for 5 years, through 2024.

As the vice chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, I know how critical this bill is to Indian Country. Data from the U.S. Department of Justice indicates that Native women face murder rates that are more than 10 times the national average murder rate. There are more than 5,000 cases of missing American Indian and Alaska Native women, and 55 percent of Native women have experienced domestic violence. More than four in five American Indian and Alaska Native women experience violence in their lifetimes. Without enactment of a VAWA reauthorization, these Tribes will lack the jurisdictional tools they need to keep their communities safe.

The VAWA bill also explicitly states that grant recipients can train staff to

prevent LGBT discrimination, and it adds dating partners convicted of domestic violence and stalking to the category of persons barred from having handguns.

This bill would make a real difference in preventing violent crimes against women and has passed the House and has been pending before us here in the Senate for many months.

For these reasons, I respectfully object to the Senator’s request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, first of all, let me just say that bringing up VAWA can’t be anything other than an attempt to obfuscate from the case that is in front of us. I would be happy to talk about VAWA. I happen to agree that violence against women is a serious issue. It is a serious problem. All the programs in VAWA are still fully funded. They continue.

I don’t think anybody in this body or the other body has done as much as I have done to make sure that the resources in the Crime Victims Fund go to the victims of crime—very much including women who are victims of violent crime and children and the groups who serve those victims.

As a matter of fact, I have supported previous versions of VAWA. There has been a bipartisan effort to get a new reauthorization of VAWA. Senator ERNST and Senator FEINSTEIN have spent months developing that. But that is not the version that has been under consideration here.

No, there is nothing incompatible about passing my legislation, the Thin Blue Line Act, standing up to protect local law enforcement, and having a separate consideration on VAWA. They are not mutually exclusive. They are not in any way related to each other. But, unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues are not willing to simply extend the same protection we extend to Federal law enforcement officials to the local law enforcement officials who are at risk every single day.

I am very disappointed that my colleague from New Mexico would object to a very simple and sensible bill that has bipartisan support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2843

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, as if in legislation session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2843, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, for the reasons that I mentioned earlier in my comments, I object to this version of VAWA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, thank you for the recognition today.

We rise—a number of Senators who will be speaking today in this hour—we rise today to demand that the White House immediately remove William Perry Pendley from exercising the authority of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and nominate a qualified person to be Director, subject to Senate confirmation.

William Perry Pendley embodies the Trump administration’s approach to conservation—they don’t believe in it. He embodies the Trump administration’s approach to Tribal sovereignty—they don’t respect it. His continued employment at BLM embodies the Trump administration’s approach to the law and the separation of powers—they will trample all over it every chance they get.

Mr. Pendley has been exercising the authority of the Director since July 2019. Let’s get one thing straight: This title has no basis in law. He is serving as Acting BLM Director under temporary appointments that the Secretary keeps renewing in a cynical ploy to evade the Constitution, the Federal Vacancies Reform Act, and the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. Pendley’s record on conservation is so bad, so antithetical to the agency he oversees, that the Trump administration knew he wouldn’t survive a Senate confirmation. So, instead, they have concocted this shell game.

The Director of BLM is subject to Senate confirmation. This administration did not bother to nominate anyone for 4 years until June of this year when Mr. Pendley was formally nominated. However, the ink had barely dried on his nomination papers before the President was forced to withdraw the nomination.

From the beginning, the conservation outdoor recreation sports men and women communities have been uniformly opposed to Mr. Pendley’s appointment, but that is not why the President withdrew his nomination. He withdrew the nomination because Mr. Pendley’s extreme anti-public lands positions made him too toxic for Republican Senators from Western States facing tough reelections.

If Mr. Pendley can’t be confirmed as BLM Director, he should not remain the de facto leader of the agency. He should be immediately removed. No more shell games. There are many reasons Mr. Pendley is unfit to serve, more than I have time to discuss, but let me discuss three with you now.

First, over the course of his 40-year career, he has established himself as one of the premier anti-public lands crusaders in the Nation. He has repeatedly advocated that the Federal Government sell off public lands, arguing that was the Nation’s Founders’ intent.

As recently as 2016, he penned an op-ed entitled—and I quote here from his

op-ed—"The Federal Government Should Follow the Constitution and Sell Its Western Lands." This is from the man who is now charged with running the agency that oversees our public lands. It is appalling.

BLM manages 245 million acres on behalf of the American people. Managing these public lands is the central mission of the job, and he doesn't think there should be any. It is no wonder he is trouble for western Republican candidates. Poll after poll of westerners show overwhelming support for public lands among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. Selling off our national heritage to the highest bidder is extreme and extremely unpopular.

Mr. Pendley has been singularly focused on renting out our public lands to extraction industries to the exclusion of other purposes, such as conservation, outdoor recreation, and preservation of cultural and historic values.

As Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy and Minerals for the Department of the Interior in the 1980s, Pendley was a tireless advocate for opening up public lands, from the Outer Continental Shelf to wilderness areas, to drilling and mining. When he was in charge of coal leasing in the interior in the 1980s, he helped coal companies get a sweetheart deal—leasing 1.6 million tons of coal in the Powder River Basin at bargain basement prices. The General Accounting Office concluded that Federal taxpayers received about \$100 million below fair market value for that sale, or about \$286 million in today's dollars.

Mr. Pendley was removed from his position after that GAO report, and he hasn't changed one bit over the years. As executive director of the Mountain States Legal Foundation for 30 years, Pendley fought tooth and nail for drilling and mining on our public lands. If left unchecked, I have no doubt Mr. Pendley will continue to turn back the clock on 60 years of our Nation reckoning with the devastating consequences of recklessly extracting from the Earth.

Second, Mr. Pendley's well-documented racist attitudes make him unfit for his role. He has disdain for Native Americans—their Tribal sovereignty and their religious practices. He is very anti-immigrant. He smears the Black Lives Matter movement. He called Native religious views: "pantheism, paganism, and cultural myths." He has fought against protecting their sacred sites on Federal lands.

It is Pendley's BLM that wanted to hold virtual meetings to determine the future of the greater Chaco Canyon landscape at the same time that the Navajo Nation was facing one of the worst COVID-19 outbreaks in the country. And in that area that has some of the lowest broadband rates in the Nation—now talk about tone-deaf—as the vice chair of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, I am here to say that

Mr. Pendley has no business managing lands that are home to sacred Native sites. He has questioned the basis of Tribal sovereignty and even Tribal recognition. He wrote: "The day may come sooner than many expect given that, with ever-declining blood quantum per tribal member, recognized tribes may soon be little more than associations of financial convenience."

Let's call Mr. Pendley's offensive statement what it is: overt racism. But his disdain for people of color is not limited to Native Americans. He has called undocumented immigrants "a cancer." He has claimed immigration will lead to: "You and I permanently losing the country we love." He has claimed undocumented immigrants create violent crime, crowded schools, and spread disease. Mr. Pendley's racism has no place in today's America. He is unqualified to manage public lands at a time when we all should be working to make them more accessible to all America.

People of color who have business before the Bureau of Land Management, as many do every day, have every right to wonder: Is the deck stacked against them? It shouldn't be that way.

And, finally, a third reason that all of us should demand Mr. Pendley be removed from his position: He is a climate change denier. The science of climate change that is happening and that is human-caused is well established. We are years and years beyond any scientific argument on these points. Just open your eyes and look at the wildfires that are raging throughout the West, forcing people to evacuate their homes and making wide swaths of the West look like an apocalyptic scene out over a Hollywood movie. Yet Pendley has claimed that climate change is like unicorns—neither exist.

Pendley's hostility to science comes as no surprise. He is working for a President who claimed just yesterday, as he made a belated visit to California, that "I don't think science knows," referring to climate change. The President is saying: "I don't think science knows."

The President claims he knows, insisting, "It will start getting cooler." This President tries to undermine any institution that challenges his world view—whether it is science, the press, our national intelligence agencies, or the courts.

But while Mr. Pendley and the President deny the reality of climate change, right now, today, in California and Oregon, BLM and other public lands are burning. While they put their heads in the sand on climate change, the families who have lost loved ones in this unprecedented fire season in that part of the country and the thousands who have lost homes don't have that luxury. In the view of William Pendley, the President, and his administration, the West is a place to be plundered for natural resources and then left to burn. And while Pendley

and the Trump administration don't think the Interior Department has any role to play combating climate change, in fact, one-quarter—25 percent—of all U.S. carbon emissions come from fossil fuels extracted from public lands.

Our public lands are a big part of the climate change problem. Instead of being a source of pollution, public lands must be an integral part of the climate solution. William Pendley's vision for public lands is some terrible caricature that should be consigned to the history books, where our public lands are to be exploited, not conserved, where Native people are scorned and people of color are not seen, and where climate change does not exist.

William Pendley is an extremist, and he was never going to be confirmed by the U.S. Senate. It is time he is shown the door.

I now turn to my colleagues who are with me on the floor. I am very proud to introduce my good friend and colleague, New Mexico's junior—soon-to-be senior Senator—Senator MARTIN HEINRICH. Martin led the entire Senate Democratic caucus in a letter to the President opposing Mr. Pendley's nomination as BLM Director, and once the nomination was withdrawn, he led the caucus urging the Secretary to remove Mr. Pendley from his Acting position.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HURRICANE LAURA

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, at the forbearance of my colleagues, if I can interpolate, if you will, and I will yield back. Thank you very much.

As I speak, Hurricane Sally threatens the gulf coast, including parts of Louisiana. Our prayers are with those in the path of Sally. I just spoke with the Coast Guard admiral in charge, and the Coast Guard is ready should there be a need.

But in the concern over Sally and other issues, we must remember the aftermath of Hurricane Laura, which made landfall August 27 in Cameron, LA, as a category 4-5 hurricane. In terms of wind speed, this is 150 miles an hour. A more powerful storm in that regard is Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, and others.

As you might imagine, a storm of such magnitude left death, destruction, and pain from Southwest Louisiana into Texas to North Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi.

There were 25 people who died directly or indirectly because of Hurricane Laura, and hundreds of thousands of lives have been upended. As one example—one measure—as of yesterday, 145,000 people in Louisiana have filed for assistance with FEMA. That is expected to grow to roughly 2,800 people a day applying for assistance.

Now, the sentiment at home is if you are without electricity, as 97 percent of Cameron Parish goes without electricity, and you are without internet, as most people are, the fear is that

folks have forgotten about Hurricane Laura, that recovery efforts will be stalled, and things will be ignored as attention turns to other issues—COVID-19, Presidential race, et cetera. And, anecdotally, there is, of course, evidence that public opinion has slipped.

Last week, I spoke with Gail McGovern, the president of the American Red Cross, who told me that donations are lagging well below that which the Red Cross had hoped to receive to cover the cost of their response. She assured me, though, that the Red Cross would still do everything needed. I saw testimony of that, by the way. I flew from Louisiana to Washington, DC, yesterday, and the jet was full of Red Cross volunteers. We are so appreciative.

I assure folks back home, just to say, that I did get a call from President Trump just as the hurricane hit. He assured me that whatever resources were needed, he would make sure they were there. As I told folks in Louisiana, there was an audience of one paying attention, a very important audience, and that is the President.

In this speech, I hope to continue to bring this hurricane and its aftermath to the attention of other fellow Americans because fellow Americans take care of ourselves and take care of each other. So I am here to be a voice for the people of Louisiana and share a story so that you may know what we are facing at home.

Again, I am appreciative of the United Way, American Red Cross, President Trump, and others for swiftly doing all they can do to help us through this recovery, but let's tell the story.

Here is a wonderful story from Lake Arthur, LA. She probably doesn't like the fact that I am showing this. She didn't like how she looked. I think she looks fantastic. This is Bethel Boudreaux, a great American patriot and a great Louisiana name. If you look at this picture, there is a tree that has fallen over the guy's house. There is a fellow in the tree cutting down limbs that is on top of his house. Here she is with a tree behind her and all the debris associated with it holding up an American flag. Now, her concern was that if we showed this picture, we recognize that her husband, a veteran, is familiar with how damaged flags should be destroyed, but this had been fluttering during the hurricane, and she just wanted to show it.

She has got a smile. This is 1 or 2 days after this devastating hurricane. With all this, in the spirit of Americans, she is holding that flag, and she is smiling. She is a great American patriot, but it also shows the attitude of Americans and the attitudes of people in Louisiana. We are resilient in the face of adversity.

There is more than enough adversity to go around. Let me just give you a couple of stories that are on our Facebook page. Mike Williams from Lake Charles gave our office a tour of

his home. His metal roof was completely ripped off. Water came all through his house. The ceiling is falling in, and every single room has extensive water damage.

There is 20-year-old Hannah Vinson, who shared that her childhood home was gone. The roof collapsed, flooded, and a tree fell in her mother's bedroom and all across their yard. She has this semester off from school because of lack of access and expenses she cannot cover, even though she works.

She told us:

It's overwhelming. People say why even go back when your school is destroyed? I start a new career, and that has to come to an end because where I work is gone now.

There are thousands more stories like theirs. But amid the devastation, there is hope. I am inspired by those who rushed to help however they could.

The Cajun Navy is an organization of volunteers who respond to disasters. They deployed immediately and continue to help today, delivering thousands of meals, clearing debris, helping people meet energy needs, and assisting where they can.

I recently went to Central Louisiana to hand out supplies and meet with storm victims and volunteers. I met a woman named Mandy in Hineston. Mandy has been loading up trailers of donated groceries. She takes them to the rural parts of the State, where folks can't access critical supplies in Central and Western Louisiana. This is a critical service because folks on the back roads couldn't get out, and there was a gas shortage in some storm-affected areas.

While I do believe Hurricane Laura recovery needs more attention nationally, I am so thankful for the thousands of workers who came to rebuild the electrical grid, as well as individuals and churches and nonprofits who came to help. There is a Facebook video from YAIPaks—a nonprofit organization in Clarksville, TN—who came down to Lake Charles with portable showers and trailers of supplies. The lady in the video said they handed out so many meals that they lost count.

I cannot say thank you enough to our fellow Americans and those from Louisiana who saw a need and answered the call to serve. Now I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Local governments' resources have been stretched to the limit because of COVID-19—tax base destroyed. Damage assessments are still underway, but we will likely need a disaster supplemental from Congress to continue the recovery. I ask my fellow Senators to consider the plight of Hurricane Laura victims and support such a bill, which should include California due to the terrible wildfires and perhaps those affected by Sally. Our prayers are with all of those as well.

Local government resources have been stretched to the limit because of COVID-19 in Louisiana, but I suspect in California and Alabama and Mississippi as well.

In June, I introduced legislation to do away with the FEMA cost share for local governments for 2020—for this year—given the strain on their budgets caused by COVID. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

Lastly, let's just reassure my constituents in Louisiana that they are not forgotten. The largest storm in our State's history made news for about 2 days with hardly a mention after. Don't forget about Hannah, who lost her childhood home and her job, or about Mike, who lost his house to the rain and wind, and about the nearly 150,000 people asking for help.

Americans are at our best when we help those in need. The time is now to extend that support once more.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ACTING
DIRECTOR WILLIAM PENDLEY

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking my colleague Senator UDALL for organizing us to talk about the current Acting Director of the Bureau of Land Management. I say "acting" because this is an individual who would not be able to be confirmed by this body. But I want to take a step back and walk through a little bit about why this is important.

There was once a strong young man who rose up through New York City society. He led American soldiers in battle and went west to learn what it meant to truly to work hard on America's western landscapes.

This man took all of his hard-driving spirit with him to the White House and put it to work delivering for the American people. He took on big trusts and gigantic corporations that had monopolized the American economy and put a stranglehold on American workers. Despite coming from a wealthy New York family, this man focused on delivering a "Square Deal" to working-class Americans. But perhaps his most important and lasting legacy was this: After our country's previous century of explosive growth across the North American continent, he saw clearly that we needed to rein in the pillaging of our forests, the draining of our wetlands, the destruction of America's wildlife, and the loss of irreplaceable cultural resources. He saw that we had only one chance left to protect the splendors of our uniquely American landscapes for future generations.

When Donald Trump looks up every once in a while from his television screen or from yet another tweetstorm portrait on his phone to the portrait of that great American President, I am sure he sometimes tells himself that he could be just like Teddy Roosevelt.

I am sure he imagines that he is equally deserving of a place on Mount Rushmore and that if it weren't for his bone spurs, he could have been just as tough as Teddy, charging up San Juan Hill or riding on horseback through the Dakota Badlands rather than jumping

into a golf cart. These delusions of grandeur reached a new height last week, when the President told a crowd in Florida that he has been “the number one environmental president since Teddy Roosevelt.”

I don't really need to tell you that this claim is just about as absurd as saying that he has done a great job protecting Americans from the coronavirus that has now led to the deaths of nearly 200,000 of our countrymen or his claims, frankly, that he deserves a Nobel Peace Prize for sending love letters to a nuclear-armed despot in North Korea or making long-term peace in the Middle East even more out of reach.

Let's pause and take a look at what President Trump's record has actually been on the environment. Yes, I will acknowledge that President Trump has signed some great pieces of conservation legislation that many of us here in the Senate worked hard to pass with veto-proof majorities. But since taking office, President Trump has also empowered an Army of former oil, coal, and timber industry lobbyists to roll back nearly every protection of wildlife habitat, clean air, and clean water that they could get their hands on.

He has systematically attacked climate science, setting us up for worse and worse natural disasters like the fires that we are now experiencing across the West.

Just 1 year into his Presidency, Donald Trump did something no President in the last 100 years would have ever thought to do. He completely erased national monument designation for treasured red rock landscapes in Southern Utah's Bears Ears. By doing so, he also gutted key protections for cultural sites that Tribal nations across the American Southwest hold to be sacred.

That egregious and, I believe, illegal action cut against the very heart of the Antiquities Act. This is the law that many Presidents over the last century used to protect so many of our national monuments and national parks. The Antiquities Act was truly Teddy Roosevelt's landmark conservation achievement during his Presidency.

Rather than carry on Roosevelt's legacy, President Trump used the Antiquities Act in a novel, new way. He used it to unprotect two national monuments—Bears Ears and Grand Staircase-Escalante. Now over 2 million acres of the most paleontologically important and culturally significant sites in the entire Southwest are open for uranium mining, ATV abuse, and fossil fuel extraction.

Just a few weeks ago, in a similarly destructive act, President Trump opened up our Nation's marquee national wildlife refuge in the Arctic to industrial oil and gas drilling. It seems there are no landscapes that are too sacred to make a quick buck in this White House. Not even the calving grounds of the porcupine caribou herd will have been spared. He is also now

threatening to allow previously unthinkable proposals, like uranium mining in the Grand Canyon.

I don't think anyone in their right mind could call that a great record of conservation or environmentalism, not by any measure.

That takes us to why we are here today—President Trump's decision to put William Perry Pendley in charge of the public lands that are the birthright of every American.

We have a saying in New Mexico: “Dime con quien andas y te dire quienes.” Loosely translated, it means: “Tell me who you hang around with, and I will tell you who you are.” I think it says a great deal that President Trump has chosen to hang around with William Perry Pendley.

For the last 30 years, Mr. Pendley has been a driving force in a campaign fueled by anti-government propaganda—and propped up by special interests and extractive industry dollars—to seize and sell off the American people's public lands.

As an industry-paid lawyer and lobbyist, Mr. Pendley has fought against hunting and fishing access laws and supported the elimination of protections for our national monuments. In fact, he has championed the repeal of the very law that Teddy Roosevelt used to protect our Grand Canyon.

He has filed numerous lawsuits in State and Federal courts, seeking to deny access to public lands for sportsmen and attacking key protections for wildlife, clean air, and clean water.

Now President Trump has placed him in charge of the Federal agency that manages so many of our public lands across the West. This is the man who is on record saying that we should “sell all BLM lands” east of the Mississippi. President Trump handpicked this zealot to lead the agency responsible for stewarding those very same public lands. What would Teddy Roosevelt think?

William Perry Pendley's beliefs harken back to the era right before Teddy Roosevelt's Presidency, when railroad barons, hard rock mining operators, and timber companies were given free rein over our landscapes and our natural resources. By putting Mr. Pendley in charge of the Bureau of Land Management, President Trump is saying loud and clear that he wants to take us backward to those same failed and destructive policies of the past.

I am proud that the entire Senate Democratic caucus joined a broad coalition of hunters, fishermen, wildlife advocates, and outdoor recreation enthusiasts, all of whom called on President Trump to withdraw Mr. Pendley's nomination. Thanks to that widespread outcry from those of us who love our public lands, President Trump was forced to withdraw Mr. Pendley's nomination last month. But forcing the Trump administration to withdraw the Pendley nomination was only half the battle.

In fact, William Perry Pendley is still sitting in his office today, leading

the Bureau of Land Management in his previous “acting” role.

President Trump has shown that he is willing to circumvent Congress and skip the constitutionally required confirmation process for other key Federal leadership posts by illegally placing people into unofficial and indefinite “acting” roles. Mr. Pendley has now been serving in one of these “color outside the lines” acting posts for well over a year.

As long as the Republican Senate majority refuses to act on its constitutional duty to hold this administration accountable on nominations like this, Mr. Pendley and other Trump officials in “acting” roles can and will continue to operate with impunity. That is not right, and in this case, we are talking about someone whose whole career has been built on opposition to the very idea that public lands should remain in public hands.

Mr. Pendley's role in the Trump administration represents a direct attack on Teddy Roosevelt's legacy for our environment. The mission of public land management should be focused on serving the American public and safeguarding the values that deliver benefits to the American people.

In these times, that means that work by the leaders of our land management agency should be rooted in the conservation of our wildlife, our water, and our landscapes. Their mission should include expanding access to outdoor recreation, preserving biodiversity, restoring healthy carbon sequestering forests and productive watersheds. They should work alongside Tribal nations and rural communities to protect cultural landscapes and promote sustainable economic development—or as Teddy Roosevelt put it more simply and much more artfully than I could all those years ago:

Here is your country. Cherish these natural wonders, cherish the natural resources, cherish the history and romance as a sacred heritage. . . . Do not let selfish men or greedy interests skin your country of its beauty, it is riches or its romance.

The question before us here in the Senate is whether we will stand by as those greedy interests take what is our American birthright or whether we will stand up for our sacred heritage.

I choose to stand up. I hope the Presiding Officer and my colleagues will join us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, as the ranking member on the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, I was especially pleased by President Trump's decision to withdraw the nomination of William Perry Pendley to lead the Bureau of Land Management, or the BLM, as we know it.

I said, when the President nominated Mr. Pendley, that he is the wrong person in the wrong job in the wrong place and he should not continue to lead the Bureau. The job of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management is not

just another Presidential appointment. It is a sacred public trust. The Director of the BLM is one of the principal stewards of our public lands, as we are hearing from our colleagues today.

The Bureau of Land Management manages 245 million acres of public land, more land than any other Federal agency. The Bureau is required by law to manage the lands committed to its care not only for the benefit of our own generation but for many generations to come. It must carefully balance the use of the land for grazing, timber production, mineral development, recreation, fish and wildlife, and the protection of scenic, scientific, and historic values of the lands.

In addition to the 245 million acres of surface land the Bureau manages, it also manages another 700 million acres of subsurface mineral rights. It manages over 63,000 oil and gas wells and over 300 coal leases, covering nearly half a million acres of coal lands, which together contribute about \$4 billion a year to the Federal Treasury.

It manages another 55 million acres of timberlands and 155 million acres of grazing lands. It issues permits for wind, solar, and geothermal energy development. In addition, more than 10 years ago, Congress designated about 36 million acres of the lands by the Bureau as National Conservation Lands because of their outstanding cultural, ecological, and scientific value.

National Conservation Lands include 28 national monuments covering nearly 8 million acres, over 260 wilderness areas covering nearly 10 million acres, nearly 3,000 miles of wild and scenic rivers, and nearly 6,000 miles of historic and scenic trails.

Nearly 50 years ago, Congress declared that the public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management should be retained in Federal ownership and managed to preserve and to protect them without permanent impairment of the productivity of the land and the quality of the environment.

That, in a nutshell, is the job of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management: to be a good and faithful steward of the people's lands so that we might pass them on to our children and our children's children in at least as good condition as we inherited them, if not better.

Mr. Pendley is not the right person for this job. He spent most of his adult life arguing against the principles upon which our Federal land management policy is based. He has called for the sale of the public lands that the BLM is responsible for retaining and managing. He has called for the repeal of the Antiquities Act, upon which our national monuments were founded.

He has denigrated the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Clean Water Act—the bedrock of environmental laws that the Bureau must operate under. He cannot be a good steward of the public domain if he does not believe the pub-

lic should have a domain and he rejects the laws designed to preserve and protect it.

His extreme views and inflammatory rhetoric do not stop with the public lands. He has denied the existence of climate change, comparing it to a unicorn, and those who acknowledge it as “kooks.” He said that the Black Lives Matter movement is based on a lie. He has said that undocumented immigrants are “like a cancer.”

Mr. Pendley was nominated for office once before. People might not realize that. President Reagan nominated him to be the Assistant Secretary for Energy and Minerals in 1983. While his nomination was pending, he was being investigated by the Department of the Interior's inspector general and the Department of Justice for possibly violating conflict of interest rules.

The Senate returned his nomination to the President, and he was not confirmed. The General Accounting Office later found that the Interior Department sold the coal leases in the Powder River Basin at roughly \$100 million less than their estimated fair market value. The below-market sales were made possible by a change in bidding procedures approved by Mr. Pendley on the same day that he had dinner with the coal industry lawyers.

The inspector general referred the matter to the Justice Department for possible criminal prosecution. The Justice Department ultimately declined to prosecute Mr. Pendley, but he left the Department shortly afterward.

For all of these reasons, I think Mr. Pendley is the wrong person to lead the Bureau of Land Management. Today, he is still there in the position and having the authority to run the BLM. He should not be there a minute longer.

The President was right to withdraw his nomination. Now it would be right for the President to remove him from that position. Withdrawing his nomination doesn't solve the problem. We know that. It is outrageous that he continues to exercise the authority of the Director, despite having been nominated and withdrawn for cause.

Although the legality of his role is a matter of opinion in the courts right now, Mr. Pendley is still, in effect, running the Bureau of Land Management and continuing to make decisions negatively impacting millions of acres of public lands of significant importance to millions of Americans, all without the proper vetting and approval of the Senate. That is simply wrong, and I believe on both sides of the aisle we know wrong when we see it.

He should resign. Secretary Bernhardt should remove him, or the President should step in and remove him. Withdrawing his nomination was a step in the right direction, but for all the reasons I have outlined today, William Pendley is not qualified to be managing—to be managing—our Nation's treasured public lands in any capacity. So I would ask President Trump to

kindly and respectfully step in and remove a person who does not justify the office that he is holding right now and the decisions he is making for all of us in our generation and in generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, Nevada's public lands are a source of pride and natural beauty, but they are also so much more. They are a source of economic strength for our outdoor industries, and they help support our communities and our State's economy.

Each year, tens of thousands of visitors come to Nevada to see and experience our majestic public lands and our monuments firsthand. We must keep our State's public lands open and accessible for Nevadans, for visitors to our State, and for future generations. That is why we are passionate about protecting and preserving our State's natural wonders.

Public lands make up a big part of our State. In fact, over 80 percent of our land is managed by the Federal Government, and well over 60 percent of Nevada—close to 48 million acres—is managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

I stand here today before you because our Nation's public lands are in danger, not just from the threat of climate change or from deadly wildfires, which are raging across our Nation's Western States as we speak, but also from an unconfirmed and unaccountable acting head of the Bureau of Land Management, Mr. William Perry Pendley. It is well past time for him to go. Allow me to explain just how dangerous Mr. Pendley is for our public lands and for Nevada.

In the past, Nevada has been able to strike a balance between the protection of our public lands and the need for development. That is how things should be. But Mr. Pendley does not respect this balance. When it comes to our public lands, Mr. Pendley has a longtime and documented history of working to destroy our national treasures.

Some of the highlights of Mr. Pendley's disturbing anti-public-land actions and sentiments include this: working on behalf of private interests to roll back critical public land protections during his tenure at a law firm; advocating for the repeal of the Antiquities Act, a landmark law signed by President Teddy Roosevelt that protects our public lands and gives the President the power to designate national monuments; and fighting to drill on sacred Native American lands while mocking these same Native Americans' religious beliefs.

This is a man put in charge of one-third of our Nation's public lands who has referred to the National Environmental Policy Act, our Nation's bedrock environmental law, as “a terrible burden,” who has written that “the Founding Fathers intended all lands

owned by the Federal Government to be sold," who has aggressively pushed oil and gas leasing on our public lands, and who views climate change as "junk science."

Mr. Pendley holds shocking and extremist views and has consistently worked to dismantle the very lands he is in charge of protecting. The administration knows just how bad Mr. Pendley is, which is why it has withdrawn his nomination to serve as Director of the BLM.

His nomination would never pass the Senate. However, it is unacceptable that Mr. Pendley continues to run the Bureau of Land Management as Acting BLM Director. This bureaucratic loophole allows Mr. Pendley to indefinitely serve as the de facto head of the BLM without a confirmation hearing before the American people and in direct defiance of the Senate's constitutional responsibility to advise and consent to executive nominations.

My office has heard from thousands of Nevadans about the importance of our public lands or to raise their concerns about Mr. Pendley—and with good reason. As I said before, the Bureau of Land Management oversees 67 percent of Nevada, and if Mr. Pendley sells off our State's public lands, Nevadans will be the ones paying the price.

I share the concerns of my constituents. Mr. Pendley was unfit to be confirmed as Director, and he is unfit to exercise the authority of the Director without being confirmed. For these reasons, this summer I joined my Senate colleagues in asking Secretary Bernhardt to remove Mr. Pendley from his unconfirmed position immediately.

I stand here today to reiterate: Mr. Pendley must step down or be removed. I call on the President to nominate a qualified Director through the standard confirmation process, one who understands the balance of conservation and development and who has respect for the job that they would hold, because Nevadans can't afford to find out if Mr. Pendley will put two-thirds of our State on the chopping block.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Colorado, Senator MICHAEL BENNET.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I appreciate very much my colleague from Nevada.

Let me start by welcoming the Presiding Officer back to the Senate. We are glad that you are here and that you are feeling better.

I thank my colleague from New Mexico, my neighbor, the senior Senator from New Mexico, Senator UDALL, for organizing this today. This is, I know, a matter that is very close to his heart. Thanks in large part to Senator UDALL's leadership and the leadership of the Senator from Arizona and others, we have worked really hard to not have public lands be a partisan issue in the Senate, and I think that reflects the way it is out West, where our pub-

lic lands really are the foundation of our economy and who we are. They make us who we are. They are a cultural touchstone for all of us in the West.

Instead of comprehending this, President Trump, as he has done in so many other areas, has pursued a public lands agenda that is way outside the mainstream of conventional American thought. Few decisions better capture how extreme that position is and how frenzied his agenda is than his decision to hire William Perry Pendley to lead the Bureau of Land Management.

As we have heard today, Mr. Pendley doesn't even believe in the idea of public lands. He has argued that the Founding Fathers intended for all Federal lands to be sold. Think about what that would have meant if we had sold off the public lands of the United States.

They are the envy of the world. They are the envy of the world, and all of the work that Teddy Roosevelt and others had done to make sure that our generation would be able to benefit would have been lost if Pendley's constitutional interpretation had controlled.

Asking someone like that to manage our public lands, including 8.3 million acres in Colorado, is like asking somebody to be Secretary of Education who doesn't believe in public education. Given the track record of this administration, I guess it is not that surprising that he would put somebody in charge of public lands who believed that they are actually illegal or unconstitutional.

Mr. Pendley is by far the most extreme anti-public lands nominee in my lifetime. You have heard the Senator from New Mexico talk about his attacks on people of color. You have heard about the fact that he doesn't believe in climate change. Pendley's ideology on public lands, on climate, and on so many other issues doesn't look anything like the consensus we have worked so hard to try to establish in Colorado.

I think fundamental to this is that his extreme ideology does not perceive or conceive the economic reality in Colorado or New Mexico or Nevada or Arizona or Montana, where public lands sustain local businesses and climate change is undermining our farmers and ranchers.

Since the BLM moved to Colorado, sort of, we have had a front row seat to this extremist agenda. This spring, Pendley signed off on a resource management plan that opened up the North Fork Valley of the Gunnison—one of our most beautiful agricultural valleys in Colorado—to more oil and gas development.

Local leaders worried that his plan failed to protect the region's watershed and will threaten the area's agricultural and outdoor economy. Instead of listening to Colorado, Mr. Pendley signed off on a plan, as he so often does, written in Washington by a bunch of special interests here who want to plunder our land out there.

As Senators, we have a constitutional responsibility to ensure that the people entrusted with leading our Federal agencies are, at a minimum, qualified for the positions they hold and I would hope are within the mainstream of conventional American political ideology, but we have not been allowed to do that in this case.

Mr. Pendley was nominated by the President to lead the BLM. The response was so negative that I have to imagine there were Senators on the other side of the aisle who said: Senator MCCONNELL, please don't make us take this vote. Please. I have a tough election coming up.

Don't make me take this vote, Mr. President. I am scared to take this vote.

As a result, they withdrew his nomination because it couldn't pass the Senate. That is how the system is supposed to work. You can always put it on the floor and see whether we will support it. In this case, the response was so negative, they withdrew the nomination. That happens regularly. What is incredibly unusual in this case is they left him in his job. Having demonstrated that there was no public support in the Senate—the Senate unwilling to take a vote for fear of how unpopular it would be in the Western United States—they said: Well, you can be the Acting BLM Director.

That is a disgrace. I don't know how anybody in this Chamber could call themselves committed to the U.S. Constitution if a President can nominate somebody, see the votes aren't there, withdraw it, and make them the Acting Director of the agency. That is the work of a dictator, not the President of the United States.

Every now and then, you would expect the leader of this body to stand up for the prerogatives of this body, to stand up for the separation of powers and for the rule of law—particularly if you call yourself a constitutional conservative.

We have a choice to make: to do nothing or to do our jobs. The American people want us to do our jobs. They are sick of the dysfunction here.

From the perspective of Colorado, the decision on Mr. Pendley is simple: Someone who spent his entire career opposed to the very idea of public lands is unfit to lead a land management agency, period.

He should do the right thing if the President won't: Step down immediately and allow somebody to take on the responsibility who actually understands how important it is to preserve the legacy our parents and grandparents created for us so we can preserve it for the next generation of Americans and the generation after that.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the eloquent words of Senator BENNET of Colorado. Not only

does Senator BENNET speak with eloquence, but he matches it with deeds and with action. He has a major piece of legislation before the Senate to try to protect public lands in his State of Colorado. We very much appreciate Senator BENNET and his activism there.

I would also like to thank Senators HENRICH, MANCHIN, and ROSEN for so eloquently talking about why William Pendley is unfit to continue as the de facto BLM Director.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, if I could just ask—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. UDALL. Yes, please.

Mr. BENNET. The Senator from New Mexico was so kind to refer to the CORE Act, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation Economy Act. Just a reminder: At the heart of that bill, which is 400,000 acres of public lands in Colorado—70,000 of which is wilderness area to protect our critical watershed—is the Camp Hale National Historic Landscape, which is the first such national historic landscape designation in the history of the United States. It memorializes the incredible work of our veterans who came to Camp Hale to train, to fight in the mountains of Northern Italy, pushed the Nazis out of Northern Italy. And that wasn't even enough for them. Then they came back, and they started our entire outdoor recreation industry, our ski resort. It was the same generation of people. That is an exact, perfect example—I am so glad Senator UDALL brought it up—a perfect example of why we need to treasure our public lands.

With that, I will yield the floor and turn it back over to Senator UDALL.

Mr. UDALL. I thank Senator BENNET once again for the good work he is doing there.

Just a couple of other words in closing, talking about the career employee scientists, the people who work at the BLM. The men and women who work at the BLM are public servants dedicated to the mission of the agency. They deserve a leader who values them and respects them and carries out that mission, not an extremist who doesn't even believe that public lands should exist.

Mr. Pendley's hostility toward our public lands resulted in his nomination as BLM Director being pulled by the President. If he is not fit to be confirmed as BLM Director by the Senate, he is not fit to exercise the authority of Director and should be immediately relieved of that authority.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON HOLCOMB NOMINATION

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 5:15 p.m. vote start at this time.

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

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Holcomb nomination?

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HENRICH), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Ex.]

YEAS—83

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

NAYS—12

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schatz
Booker	Markey	Schumer
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Capito	Harris	Sanders
Coons	Heinrich	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Senator from Tennessee.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the postcloture time with respect

to the Robinson nomination expire at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow and that following the disposition of the Robinson nomination, the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the Dugan and McGlynn nominations in that order; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Dugan and McGlynn nominations, the postcloture time expire at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in that order; finally, that if any of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be 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.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, this morning in the Education Committee, we had a really interesting discussion on intercollegiate athletics—specifically on the proposals that are appearing in various States to pay student athletes for their name, image, and likeness.

This is the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee, and Senator WICKER and his committee are considering whether there should be any congressional action, but we were looking at the impact of the proposal to pay student athletes on the tradition of the intercollegiate student athlete in our country, and here is my own view.

If student athletes are paid by commercial interests for their name, image, and likeness, that money ought to go to benefit all of the student athletes at that institution. In other words, if the quarterback at the University of Tennessee is paid \$500,000 by the local auto dealer to advertise the auto dealer, that money ought not go to him; it ought to go for the benefit of all the student athletes at the University of Tennessee, including the women's sports, the men's sports, the minor sports, the major sports.

Student athletes shouldn't be on the payroll and be treated as hired hands, in my opinion. I don't see a good ending to allowing a few student athletes to be paid by commercial interests while most of their teammates are not.

If young athletes want to be part of a team, enjoy the undergraduate experience, learn from coaches who are among the best teachers in the country, and be paid a full scholarship that helps them earn a degree worth \$1 million during their lifetime—that is according to the college boards estimates—those earnings of that student should benefit all student athletes at the institution. If a student athlete prefers to keep the money, then that student athlete should become a professional athlete.

We had a bipartisan discussion this morning. I want to thank Senator MURRAY, the Senator from Washington State, who is the ranking Democrat on our committee. Our committee always has diverse views, but we always have good, civil discussions.

We had excellent witnesses from the University of Wisconsin and from Utah State University. We had a representative of the players association as well, and we had a track and field coach from Ohio State University who has been Coach of the Year in the Big 10 for 4 years, and they all had a point of view on this question.

The question is whether the tradition of an intercollegiate student athlete is worth preserving, and if so, how do you do it? Specifically, what would the impact be on that tradition if States pass laws allowing commercial interests to pay student athletes for the use of their name, image, or likeness?

Now, I have had two experiences that help me form my own opinion on this. Here is the first one.

In 1960, during my sophomore year in college, I was exercising at Vanderbilt University on the university's cinder track, and a man watching me had in his right hand a big stopwatch. He introduced himself as Track Coach Herc Alley, and he asked my name.

"Did you run track in high school?" he asked me.

"No," I said, "we didn't have track in high school."

"Why don't you run 100 yards for me," he said.

So I did.

He examined his stopwatch and said: "10.1 seconds. That is very good. I have three really fast boys on my 440-yard relay team. Why don't you come be the fourth one?"

So I joined the Vanderbilt track team running the mile relay, the 440-yard relay, and the 440-yard dash. My job was to carry the baton from the first fast boy to the third fast boy.

The next year, our team set a school record in the 440-yard relay. That record will never be broken for one reason—because they now measure the race in meters. So they don't run the 440-yard relay anymore.

We sometimes practiced with some really speedy athletes. They were students from what we called then Tennessee A&I across town. This is before desegregation. These were Olympians. They included Ralph Boston, Wilma Rudolph, and Wyomia Tyus. Coach Alley, our coach, had no scholarships to offer. His teams rode buses to meets. Our cinder track made it hard to establish fast times. Scraping together teams of nonscholarship athletes, he produced several Southeastern Conference track champions.

Coach Alley's enthusiasm that day gave me an experience that millions of young Americans have had—that of being an intercollegiate student athlete. Some of those athletes were good enough to win scholarships. Senator RICHARD BURR is one. He is on our committee and was at the hearing this morning. He had a football scholarship at Wake Forest University.

My experience at Vanderbilt taught me a number of lessons, including this one: When running on a relay team, be sure to choose two teammates who can

run faster than you can. That is not a bad recipe for being an effective U.S. Senator either.

Now, as the college football season gets underway, even amidst COVID-19, we are reminded of how important these games are to student athletes, to their institutions, and to millions of spectators. The fascination with sporting competition is nothing new, according to the Knight Commission, which said in its 1991 report the following:

The appeal of competitive games is boundless. In ancient times, men at war laid down their weapons to compete in the Olympic games. Today, people around the globe put aside their daily cares to follow the fortunes of their teams in the World Cup. In the United States, the Super Bowl, the World Series, college football and the NCAA basketball tournament command the attention of millions. Sports have helped break down bigotry and prejudice in American life. On the international scene, they have helped integrate East and West, socialist and capitalist. The passion for sport is universally shared across time and continents.

So said the Knight Commission 30 years ago.

But concerns with problems in sports are also nothing new. The Knight Commission was established in 1989 to address scandals in college sports that were "shaking public confidence," not just of big-time collegiate athletics but the whole institution of higher education.

Well before that, in 1929, the Carnegie Foundation put out a report that said recruiting had become corrupt, professionals had replaced amateurs, education was being neglected, and commercialism reigned. Before that, in 1906, partially in response to President Teddy Roosevelt's criticism, the NCAA had been formed to protect the safety of players and deal with corruption.

My second experience forming my opinion on today's hearing was my participation and membership in that Knight Commission at the time I was president of the University of Tennessee. Our commission recommendation was that university presidents take charge of college athletics and the huge amount of television money it attracted and restore the academic and financial integrity of the program. As a result, over the next several years, academic standards became more stringent, financial support for student athletes increased, and college presidents asserted more responsibility for financial integrity.

What is especially relevant to today's hearing was that despite today's problems surrounding intercollegiate athletics and the problems then, the Knight Commission strongly endorsed keeping the student athlete tradition. What it said is worth repeating also:

We reject the argument [the Knight Commission said] that the only realistic solution to the problem is to drop the student athlete concept, put athletes on the payroll, and reduce or even eliminate their responsibilities as students.

Such a scheme has nothing to do with education, [said the Knight Commission] the

purpose for which colleges and universities exist. Scholarship athletes are already paid in the most meaningful way possible: with a free education. The idea of intercollegiate athletics is that teams represent their institutions as true members of the student body, not as hired hands. Surely American higher education has the ability to devise a better solution to the problems of intercollegiate athletics than making professionals out of the players, which is no solution at all but rather an unacceptable surrender to despair.

Well, I hope those words from the Knight Commission 30 years ago will guide how Congress deals with the newest issue threatening the concept of student athletes, and that is allowing commercial interests to pay athletes for use of their name, likeness, and image.

Already four States have enacted laws sanctioning such payments in various forms. More than 30 other States are considering legislation.

Senator WICKER, as I mentioned, chairman of the Commerce Committee, is considering whether there ought to be congressional action. Our purpose was to look at the impact on the student athlete.

Who are the student athletes today? Well, it wouldn't make much sense to talk about this if we didn't say who and what we are talking about, so here it is. There are 20 million undergraduates in about 6,000 colleges and universities that exist in the United States today. Nearly 1,100 of those 6,000 colleges and universities belong to the NCAA. More than 460,000 young men and women participate in 24 different sports each year in about one-quarter of 1 million contests. About 300 of those institutions play football and basketball at the highest level. Fewer than 2 percent of athletes, student athletes, go on to play professional sports, according to the NCAA. This means we are talking about approximately 9,000 college student athletes who compete in a few sports out of the more than 460,000 college athletes across 24 sports.

So the current controversy is about an even smaller percentage of those 9,000 students who play football, baseball, or men or women's basketball and whose skills—or the institutions for which they play—make them attractive targets for recruiting offers that will combine their scholarship dollars with endorsement money. For example, an exceptional quarterback, pitcher, or running back might be offered a \$500,000-a-year endorsement by a car dealer in the same town as a college with a big-time football, basketball, or even baseball program.

As the Knight Commission report said, student athletes are already paid in the most meaningful way, with a free education. Athletic scholarships are limited to tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, but this can add up to a lot of money. It is \$115,000 a year, estimates the University of Tennessee, per student athlete, including room, board, student stipends, academic support, meals, sports medicine, training, travel, and expenses.

Student athletes may also combine other sources of financial aid, including Federal or State need-based aid, to help pay for the full cost of attendance. These include Pell grants, for example, which could be \$6,300 a year, supplemental education community grants, work-study, State grants based on need using Federal calculations, such as the Tennessee HOPE Scholarship or the GI bill. About 92,000—or 20 percent—of the student athletes receive Pell grants also.

According to the College Board, the value of a 4-year undergraduate degree is \$1 million over a lifetime, and according to the NCAA, 88 percent of Division I student athletes will earn a 4-year degree.

So the question at hand is, Should Congress act, or should varying State laws govern payments for name, image, and likeness to student athletes? Is a patchwork set of regulations worth the confusion it will cause with unrestrained boosters, creative agents, the impact on title IX on men's and women's programs, on a coach's effort, and most of all on the tradition of the student athlete? That is the Commerce Committee's job. We heard some interesting testimony this morning.

Based on my experience as a student athlete, as a member of the Knight Commission, and as a university president, I offered these suggestions:

The Knight Commission is correct to say that student athletes shouldn't be on the payroll. They shouldn't be treated as hired hands.

Two, Congress should act but in a limited way—as limited as possible—to authorize an independent entity, safe from litigation, to write rules governing payments for the use of name, image, and likeness. Congress should provide aggressive oversight of that entity rather than try to write the rules ourselves.

Three, that governing entity ought to be the NCAA. I know, I know—the NCAA is controversial, but if it is not doing its job, the presidents who are supposed to be in charge of it should reform it. Giving the job to a new entity would take forever. Giving it to an existing entity like the Federal Trade Commission, without expertise and without any responsibility for higher education, would make no sense.

Now, as to the rules that I would hope the NCAA would write, here is what I believe should be the overriding principle: Money paid to student athletes for their name, image, and likeness should benefit all student athletes in that institution. Following this principle would allow the earnings to be used for additional academic support, further study or degrees, more insurance options, and more support for injured players and other needs. It would avoid the awkwardness of a center who earns nothing snapping the ball to a quarterback who earns \$500,000 from the local auto dealer. It avoids the inevitable abuses that would occur with agents and boosters becom-

ing involved with outstanding high school athletes. It would avoid the unexpected consequences to other teams in an institution because of the impact on title IX or the impact on existing student aid available to athletes.

Such a principle would preserve the right of any athlete to earn money for the use of his or her image, name, or likeness. It simply says: If you elect to be a student athlete, your earnings should benefit all student athletes at your institution. If you want to keep the money and be someone's employee, go become a professional.

This system would create the same kinds of choices that today's NCAA rules for college baseball require. A high school student must stay 3 years if he chooses to participate in a college baseball program. Take Vanderbilt's baseball program. David Price, Sonny Gray, and Dansby Swanson—Major League fans know they are all very successful professional athletes—all were drafted by Major League baseball teams while they were in high school. They could have earned a lot of money going directly into professional baseball. Instead, they chose a Vanderbilt education, 3 years of college experience, and the opportunity to be taught by Coach Tim Corbin, a great teacher. If Price, Gray, and Swanson had been permitted to sell their name, image, and likeness while at Vanderbilt, under the principle I am suggesting, their earnings would have been used for the benefit of all of Vanderbilt's sports teams, men and women.

Applying such a principle to all intercollegiate athletics might cause a few talented athletes to join professional leagues immediately after high school. That is their right. But if that young athlete prefers the college experience, the expert coaching and teaching, the free education, the other academic support, and the undergraduate degree that can earn \$1 million over a lifetime, then their earnings ought to benefit all the student athletes at the institution.

While the NCAA is making new rules, I suggest it ought to assign most of the new television revenue that comes to institutions—let it go to institutions and be used for academic support for student athletes rather than continue to encourage inordinately high salaries for some coaches.

As I said at the beginning, I don't see a good ending to allowing a few student athletes to be paid by commercial interests while most of their teammates are not. If they want to be part of the team, enjoy the undergraduate experience, learn from coaches who are great teachers, and be paid a full scholarship that could help them earn \$1 million during their lifetimes, their earnings should benefit all the student athletes. If they prefer to keep the money for themselves, let them become professionals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I begin by asking that the RECORD reflect how much I am going to miss the Senator from Tennessee when he is gone at the end of this year. It is nice to be on the floor with him.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, I am here for the 271st time to call this Chamber's attention to climate change and to two of the reports on this defining issue of our generation.

As I speak, wildfires are devouring the American West and consuming American lives: east of Salem, OR, two people dead in a scorched vehicle; in Butte County, CA, three dead, overrun by a fast-moving fire; in Ashland, a 1-year-old boy; in Malden, WA, almost the entire town burned down; half a million Oregonians evacuated due to fire. That is 1 out of 10 people in the entire State.

Over the weekend, Oregon's emergency management director said they are preparing for a "mass fatality event."

Paradise, CA, suffered apocalyptic destruction in the 2018 Camp Fire. It is, once again, under fire warnings, this time the North Complex fire, which has stunned firefighters with its rapid growth and ferocity.

We cannot avoid it. Climate change is here. Plenty of factors contribute to individual wildfires, but climate change is now always among them.

Last fall, I went out to the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado and met leading wildfire researcher Daniel Swain. As Dr. Swain puts it:

Climate change has not just made the extreme heat waves that coincide with fires worse. The bigger effect is the more subtle, long-term warming. That couple of degrees of (average) warming over decades . . . it's lurking in the background, sucking extra moisture out of the vegetation and the soil.

The new normal is smoke, ash, orange skies, and constant nerve-fraying vigilance.

Climate change's impacts through the West land crushing economic blows. The 2018 Camp Fire that burned Paradise cost \$16.7 billion. NOAA says natural disasters—mostly hurricanes and wildfires, both highly climate-related—inflicted \$91 billion worth of damage that year, 2018; and over the past 40 years, 241 climate- and weather-related disasters have cost Americans \$1.6 trillion.

The first report I want to talk about warns that it is not just what is lost in floods and flames. As climate risk worsens, the harder it is for communities to rebuild, for bankers to write mortgages, for owners to find insurers willing to continue to write policies and pay out claims. That risk spreads beyond burned or flooded land and runs through the rest of the economy.

Climate risk becomes what economists call systemic risk. So one of our leading regulatory agencies, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, has done a report on risk.

Think of the 2008 financial crisis. That home mortgage problem spread far beyond mortgage lenders into a brutal global recession. Millions of people who had no connection to a bad mortgage lost their jobs, lost their homes, or lost their retirement savings. Many are still recovering from that collapse.

Now think even worse. The Stanford Business School's Corporations and Society Initiative believes "the financial risks from climate change are systemic"—there is that economic word again—that these risks are "singular in nature"; and that "[g]lobal economic losses from climate change could reach \$23 trillion—three or four times the scale of the 2008 Financial Crisis."

Those of us who were here for the 2008 financial crisis don't want to see that happen again, and we certainly don't want to see it happen at a three- or four-times scale.

Senator SCHATZ and I have been calling for financial regulators to do a better job accounting for these risks. In May, we wrote to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Subcommittee on Climate-Related Market Risk. We had two simple requests: One, recommend a carbon price, and, two, urge our financial regulators to include climate risks in their core market risk assessments and supervisory practices.

The CFTC Subcommittee report is out, and I am happy to report that they did both. They write: "Financial markets will only be able to channel resources efficiently to activities that reduce greenhouse gas emissions if an economy-wide price on carbon is in place at a level that reflects the true social cost of those emissions." That is actually kind of economics 101, but it is good to hear them say it.

They went on to say:

Climate change poses a major risk to the stability of the U.S. financial system and to its ability to sustain the American economy. . . . U.S. financial regulators must recognize that climate change poses serious emerging risks to the U.S. financial system, and they should move urgently and decisively to measure, understand, and address these risks.

And what if we don't? Well, the CFTC report goes on: Failing to act would lead to what they called "disorderly repricing of assets"—that is commonly known as a crash—"with cascading effects" through the economy. Put simply, do nothing and trigger financial chaos far and wide, just like 2008, except probably worse.

The CFTC report calls for corporate America to tell the truth about climate-related risks to their business models. Investors need to know the truth for the free market to operate. The subcommittee writes that we must require "disclosure by corporations of information on material, climate-related financial risks . . . to ensure that climate risks are measured and managed effectively."

That is a key point. We have seen Exxon, for instance, downplay climate

risks to investors, shareholders, and the general public. That mischief will stop if financial regulators require an honest accounting of climate-related risks.

The CFTC report is a big deal, but it requires Congress to act. America is among the few industrialized nations worst prepared for wide-ranging reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Regulators will not be enough; Congress must act.

That is where another report comes in, the Senate Democrats' Special Report on the Climate Crisis. Under Chairman SCHATZ's leadership, we recently released a roadmap for fixing that problem. We propose a plan to cut emissions across our economy, to get on course to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius, to create a host of well-paying jobs in clean energy and other emerging technologies, and to remedy the burdens of pollution across all sectors of the economy, including those usually overlooked.

We know we have a battle ahead. The fossil fuel industry runs a covert operation that has blocked progress in Congress. This covert op is extremely well funded and has reached its roots deeply into our politics. We need to tear up those roots. This is how.

First, our report tells the dark story of that covert op: the story of the fossil fuel industry apparatus built to obscure the industry's hands behind phony front groups, the story of capture and control of corporate trade associations, the story of lives marketed by flashy PR firms, and the story of brute-force political spending and threats to blockade climate progress.

Those tactics were a test run for the fossil fuel industry by Big Tobacco: Manufacture false doubt in science and flex your political muscle against anyone who dares to challenge you. That bullying worked pretty well, and then when the Supreme Court handed down *Citizens United*, the fossil fuel industry supercharged its covert campaign with dark money, almost immediately turning the ability to spend unlimited money in politics into spending unlimited dark money in politics. Then the bullying worked really well.

Citizens United was a climate watershed. After that decision unleashed its fearful weaponry, not one Republican in this body joined any comprehensive bill to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. The Senate heartbeat of bipartisan climate activity before *Citizens United*, which I remember and experienced in 2007, 2008, and 2009, all flat-lined under the supercharged political pressure unleashed by fossil fuel interests with *Citizens United* behind them.

Our Senate report tells the full rotten story because that is step 1 in fighting covert influence. Follow the money. Show the American people how corporate interests pay to block progress on climate. Show the co-opted trade associations and the phony front groups. Let the American people see the scheme, and they are less likely to fall for it.

Second is cleaning it up. Fully exposing and ending *Citizens United* dark money and the fossil fuel scheme will take reform. Bold transparency measures like the DISCLOSE Act are needed, and our report calls for that.

Then, we need to wake up the so-called good guys in corporate America. They need to see the mischief a few bad actors have perpetrated right under their noses. They need to see how the fossil fuel industry commandeered their corporate trade associations, like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is one of the two most obstructive organizations against climate action. Why would the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, with its wide corporate membership, be one of the two most obstructive organizations against climate action unless the fossil fuel industry had co-opted it right under their noses?

The so-called good guys need to examine how their own lobbyists and their own trade associations and their own political operatives are doing on climate because with very few and very rare exceptions, the answer is that they are doing nothing on climate, not lifting a finger in Congress.

Just last week, the giant tech companies came in through their trade group TechNet, with a 13-page list of all of their lobbying priorities—13 pages and not a mention of climate. Google, Apple, Microsoft, Facebook—the Big Tech barons—a lot of big talk, and they never even mentioned climate in their shopping list for Congress.

Everyone needs to understand the two faces of corporate America and to imagine how quickly Congress would act if powerful trade associations like the chamber became actual advocates for serious climate policies or if the big interests in Congress, like Big Ag, or Big Tech, or Wall Street, or the insurance industry actually took an interest in something more than their own special interest programs and tax benefits.

What if climate had been on Big Tech's list of priorities, perhaps even on page 1 of 13? That would change the game.

A 16th century alchemist by the name of Paracelsus is credited with the phrase "sola dosis facit venenum," Latin for "the dose makes the poison." The dose makes the poison. The idea is that everything from a nerve agent to the water we need to drink to survive can be lethal if delivered in sufficient dosage.

Right now, in the American West, toxins in the climate wildfire smoke waft in such high concentrations that our typical measurement systems fail. The dosage is literally off the charts. In our Earth's atmosphere, the dosage of carbon dioxide is way outside the range of human experience, putting all of mankind into uncharted territory, to face unprecedented dangers.

Citizens United unleashed toxic doses of money, unprecedented doses of virulent dark money, into our American

political atmosphere. So our democracy is poisoned, stunned by secret fossil fuel money and threats, and, consequently, failing to listen to plain warnings like those of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

We had better act before the poison has overpowered us, and we had better get the dosages back to safe and normal levels. One good start would be to wake up to the reality of climate change.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL SCOTT GRANT

Mr. JONES. Madam President, one of the great privileges that I have enjoyed as a U.S. Senator and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee has been the opportunity to get to know and support our men and women in uniform. I have been proud to represent the people of the great State of Alabama, a State where patriotism runs deep and for whom service is a way of life.

Col. Scott Grant, U.S. Air Force, is a perfect example. Colonel Grant retired this summer, and since I was not able to attend his retirement ceremony this past Saturday, I decided I would say here what I wanted to say there, in the hangar in Birmingham, AL, where he had spent the last few years of his career.

Colonel Grant retired as the commander of the 117th Air Refueling Wing, Alabama Air National Guard, Sumpter Smith Joint National Guard Base in Birmingham, AL.

The 117th was the first military installation that I visited after my election in 2017 and swearing-in, in January of 2018. I can tell you, at that first visit, Colonel Grant set a pretty high bar for the future visits I would have to the many other military installations in Alabama, and we have quite a few. He set a high bar for those I would meet later because of his dedication to his unit, to his mission, and to the men and women he commanded.

It was immediately apparent—his dedication and professionalism—and it has guided his every decision in all our interactions over the next 2½ years. Scott's unwavering commitment to excellence earned him the respect of all those who served with him, but his genuine love for the men and women who served under his command earned him their affection. In other words, Col. Scott Grant had and has his priorities in order, and everyone who knew him and met him could see that immediately.

In 2019, the 117th won STRATCOM's Omaha Trophy. The Omaha Trophy is one of the most prestigious awards in the military. It was the first time that an Air National Guard unit had received this prestigious award. Then STRATCOM Commander Gen. John Hyten said: "The Omaha Trophy represents the best of the best in units executing strategic deterrence."

The 117th won in the area of strategic aircraft for their many missions

around the world protecting America. It was an award that the unit and Colonel Grant richly deserved. I was really honored to be present at that awards ceremony, and I can remember, as Brigadier General Stevenson said: "To put it simply, the 117th Air Refueling Wing was the most outstanding in their Nuclear Operational Readiness Inspection and their dedication to the mission itself. As a traditional guard unit, but with a total force, they have accomplished unique tasks and in an innovative way that we absolutely need to meet future challenges that STRATCOM faces." True to form, in his acceptance speech, Scott gave the credit to the men and women in his command.

With 7,000 military flight hours, Scott's deployments have spanned the globe, and his awards and decorations are almost too numerous to list. Here are just a few: the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with two oakleaf clusters, Air Medal with seven oakleaf clusters, Aerial Achievement Medal with two oakleaf clusters, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with Valor and two oakleaf clusters, Combat Readiness Medal with 10 oakleaf clusters, National Defense Service Medal with one Bronze Star, the Southwest Asia Service Medal with three Bronze Stars, the Kosovo Campaign Medal with one Bronze Star, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with one Bronze Star, the Iraq Campaign Medal with one Bronze Star, the Humanitarian Service Medal, the Alabama National Emergency Service Medal and Service Medal with one device, the Alabama Special Service Medal—and the list just goes on and on.

We could be here all night, but I will stop there and just say that, rated as a command pilot and an instructor, Colonel Grant has been described as a pilot's pilot, one from whom you learn something every time you fly with him.

So it is good news for the Air Force. The good-news-bad-news story: The bad news is the retirement from the 117th, but the good news is, in his retirement, Colonel Grant is going to continue training airmen on the KC-135 simulators in Oklahoma.

Scott, you have served your country with honor and distinction, and you are a credit to the State of Alabama and the United States of America. It is my great honor to call you a friend. Thank you.

Congratulations on an outstanding career. Best wishes for clear skies in retirement, and although I did not serve in the military, I salute you, sir.

REMEMBERING ROBERT EDINGTON

Madam President, just a few weeks ago Alabama lost one of its most distinguished and dedicated citizens, and I lost a great friend. Robert Edington, of Mobile, AL, died peacefully on July 26 with his beloved wife of 58 years, Patricia, at his side. I rise today to honor the life and legacy of this patriot; this

public servant; this devoted husband, father, grandfather, and friend.

Robert was born in Mobile on November 18, 1929, and Mobile remained in his blood until the day he died. The son of a local judge, Robert earned his undergraduate degree at Rhodes College but came back home for his law degree at the University of Alabama.

He served our Nation in the military while on Active Duty with the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955. During his active military career as a Navy operations officer, Robert was awarded the Korean Service Medal with two battle stars, the China Service Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

Robert truly loved his service to this country and the U.S. Navy, prompting him to remain with the Navy Active Reserve until 1980, when he retired as commander.

Robert Edington was one of Mobile's most prominent lawyers and community leaders for over 60 years. He served three terms in the Alabama Legislature, first as a State representative from 1962 to 1970 and then in the State senate from 1970 to 1974.

As a member of the Alabama Legislature, he played a pivotal role in establishing the University of South Alabama and the university's college of medicine. He actively furthered the development of Bishop State Community College, one of Alabama's great historically Black colleges and universities, of which I am so proud.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation in Washington, DC, presented him with their national award for his role in establishing the Alabama Historical Commission.

But his love for the Navy continued on prominent display even as a legislator, authoring the legislation that created the USS Alabama Battleship Commission, bringing the USS *Alabama* home to Mobile following her retirement from Active Duty. He served on that commission from 1963 to 1972 and served as its chairman, but his passion for the battleship and all it stands for never wavered, and he was once again appointed to the battleship commission in the year 2000.

In addition, Robert served as the Alabama President and National Director of the Navy League of the United States, where he supported port visits of Navy vessels for important occasions that included some just fun occasions like the Mardi Gras in Mobile.

Back in his hometown of Mobile, Robert was an active member of the Mobile Bar Association, where at one time he served as the director of the bar's Volunteer Lawyers Program. He was a member of the Mobile Kiwanis Club and the Mobile American Legion.

As Mobile's Consul to Guatemala for 20 years, Robert organized Mobile's first trade mission to Central America, earning him the U.S. Department of Commerce's Achievement Award.

In 2007, Robert's dedication to the community and the city of Mobile was

recognized when he received the Mobilian of the Year Award. In 2008, the following year, he was named the Rhodes College Alumnus of the Year, and in 2012, he received the distinguished honor of being named the Mobile Area Veteran of the Year.

When I think of Robert's great accomplishments, of all of those that we have talked about and listed, he will tell you that his greatest honor was marrying the love of his life, Patricia, in 1962 and having son Sherard, daughter Virginia, and a granddaughter, Courtney. With all that Robert was involved in, he was first and foremost a family man.

I have been blessed to have Robert and Pat Edington as great and dear friends for many, many years. Together, we have toiled in the vineyards of Alabama politics for longer than we can all remember. Robert, at one time, even had his eyes on the U.S. Senate seat. But as devoted as Robert was to the Democratic Party, he was also a man committed to the greater good, to working with anyone to make Mobile, AL, make the State of Alabama, and make America a better place for everyone, leaving a legacy of dedication and commitment to love of God, love of country, love of community, and love of family that is an extraordinary example for others to follow.

Our world, especially in today's climate, needs more Robert Edingtons.

RACISM

Madam President, 57 years ago today, a bomb exploded outside a church in Birmingham, AL. A bomb was placed underneath the steps that led to the sanctuary of the 16th Street Baptist Church.

Four young girls were killed in that blast: Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, Denise McNair, and Carole Robertson—killed senselessly simply because of the color of their skin. It was a tough time in America; it was a tough time in Alabama.

I am not going to recount all of what happened at that time. Many of you have heard me speak on it before because it was in 2001 and 2002 that we put the final two perpetrators into prison.

What I have spoken about this summer, though, is how 1963 and 2020 seem to align. The year 1963 in Birmingham started off with police brutality, where peaceful demonstrators who were simply trying to get civil rights for African-American people in this country were accosted with fire hoses and dogs set upon them by the police commissioner "Bull" Connor.

People took notice. People took notice when George Wallace stood at the schoolhouse door in June of 1963. People took notice when Medgar Evers was killed that same night. People took notice when Martin Luther King stood on the Mall in Washington, DC, and said he had a dream—he had a dream that one day we would all live in peace and harmony together. It was a dream of hope at that time. It was about a

month later when that bomb exploded and destroyed the dream for so many people, but at the same time, that bomb woke the conscience of America. The horrors of Jim Crow and segregation came home to roost, came down to television sets across this country, and people stood up and made their voices known and said enough is enough—not just for Birmingham in the South, but enough is enough in this country.

We have to make the changes. It woke that conscience of this country, but it also woke a conscience of a President who began to work on the Civil Rights Act. It woke the conscience of a Congress that later passed the Civil Rights Act in 1964. The conscience was aroused again in 1965 when our friend John Lewis was beaten at the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

The similarities between that and today are striking. We cannot overlook the historic moment we are in today, when once again our conscience is getting the best of us, and we see the images of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor and Ahmaud Arbery and Jacob Blake.

We also see something else. We see the images of violence. We see looting. We see the images of two police officers in Los Angeles who were brutally—brutally—attacked while just sitting in their car.

What we are seeing is really something that America is not about. It is incumbent upon us all to do something about it—to stand together, to have the discussion, to have the dialogue, to have the frank discussions about what we know is going on in law enforcement but also the violence we see in the streets. It has to stop. We have to make sure that we talk to each other, to have these dialogues.

I have talked about this before, and I will not go on and on tonight, but it is weighing heavily on everyone in this country. I know it. You know it. It is weighing on everyone. For everyone in this country, as we approach the election, it weighs heavier and heavier. Unfortunately, it gets into political discussions and partisan divides on both sides of the aisle. We cannot let that happen.

We have to come together. We have to do what John Lewis talked about and make sure that love conquers hate, however we can do it.

In that regard, I want to display this photograph. It was taken on the morning of the bombing in Birmingham. It is of an incredible stained glass window in the church. If you look closely, you will see that the most significant damage is the face of Christ that was blown out.

That picture had such an emotional impact on people in Birmingham and around the world. To this day, when people see it, it has an emotional impact because it is as if God simply cannot look at what his children are doing to his children.

We need to remember our faith. We need to remember who we are as a

country. We need to remember an image like this. No matter what faith you might believe or even if you don't have a faith, you need to remember this photograph where this stained glass window—the image of Christ—cannot bear to see what is going on. I suspect that in today's world, that image may be replicated somewhere beyond what we can touch.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

ABRAHAM ACCORDS

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, earlier today at the White House, President Trump hosted Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and the Foreign Ministers from the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain to sign the Abraham Accords.

These historic agreements began the process of normalizing relationships between the two Gulf countries and the Jewish state. After seven decades of isolation in the region, the Abraham Accords signify Israel's existence is finally being accepted by Arab countries, opening new prospects for greater economic, security, and cultural cooperation that will benefit all—those in the region and all of us around the world.

I commend President Trump, Secretary Pompeo, and many others in this administration for facilitating this historic agreement and advancing the cause of peace and prosperity in the region. This came to many of us as a surprise, but it is a welcome surprise. I am very pleased at this development.

Over the past several years, the President and Secretary have cultivated relationships in Jerusalem, Abu Dhabi, and Manama. And for longer than that, Israel and Arab countries have cooperated on important matters but behind closed doors. Capitalizing on a changing Middle East, President Trump and his administration helped shepherd these relationships into the open.

Today's signing is just a beginning for the three countries and the region as a whole. More work, obviously, is to be done, and no agreement can be easily accomplished. But my hope is that more Arab countries will follow the path of publicly recognizing Israel. Eighteen Arab states have yet to make this move, preventing relationships that can benefit the entire region.

Israel's right to exist is unquestionable, and to refuse to recognize this is to deny reality. I, along with so many other Members of this Chamber, have worked to ensure Israel's security and prosperity. With more days like today, we can hope for a region that is secure and prosperous as well for all.

I use this opportunity to commend this accomplishment, and I hope that we are able to bring more peace and stability to this region and to the rest of the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MORAN. 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.

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT MAJOR
THOMAS P. PAYNE

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor SGM Thomas P. Payne of Batesburg-Leesville and Lugoff. Just last week, on September 11, the 19th anniversary of the painful attacks on American soil, Sergeant Major Payne received the Medal of Honor, the country's highest recognition of military bravery for his outstanding efforts to liberate dozens of hostages from ISIS captors during a rescue mission in Iraq.

In his 18-year career in the Army, Sergeant Major Payne has deployed 17 times in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Inherent Resolve and to the U.S. Africa Command area of responsibility.

Thomas "Patrick" Payne enlisted in the U.S. Army shortly after graduating from Batesburg-Leesville High School in 2002, and 13 years later, his efforts have saved the lives of many. He holds several awards and decorations including the Medal of Honor, Bronze Star Medal with bronze "V" device, and three bronze oakleaf clusters, the Purple Heart, and many, many more.

Sergeant Major Payne is currently serving as an instructor assigned to the U.S. Army Special Operations Command and is stationed at Fort Bragg, NC. I want to thank Sergeant Major Payne for his service; South Carolina is very proud to have such a brave hero.

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT CHASEN
BROWN

Mr. ROMNEY. Madam President, I rise to recognize Sergeant Chasen Brown for his selfless demonstration of bravery while providing lifesaving first aid to victims of senseless violence on the evening of October 1, 2017, in Las Vegas, NV.

On that day, Sergeant Brown was suddenly and unexpectedly thrust into a massacre of his fellow citizens. As bullets rained down indiscriminately from above on innocent concert-goers, Sergeant Brown immediately began delivering critical aid to dozens of wounded victims, saving countless lives while placing his own life in extraordinary danger.

Bravery, sacrifice, and service to others are not, however, novel concepts to Sergeant Brown. As a gunner for Char-

lie Battery, 2nd Battalion, 222nd Field Artillery, Sergeant Brown has dedicated his career to serving our country. Today, we are lucky to have his service in the Utah National Guard, and our State is safer as a result. For his heroism, Governor Herbert awarded Sergeant Brown with the Utah Medal of Valor, the highest level of recognition for distinguished service. This honor is well-deserved, but the greatest reward is the gift of life that Sergeant Brown protected for the many civilians he saved that night amid terror and evil.

The great people of the State of Utah and our fellow Americans owe Sergeant Chasen Brown a debt of gratitude for his extraordinary courage under unimaginable circumstances. Thank you, Chasen.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
HEALY FOUNDATION

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, today I rise to recognize the Healy Foundation as it celebrates 10 years of supporting and facilitating the quality education of remarkable students across the country.

The James P. and Debra Fitzgerald Healy Foundation was created in 2010 by Jim and Debra's 10 children in honor of their parents' lifelong devotion to education. The couple dedicated their lives to ensuring their children received an outstanding education. Both Jim, who passed away last year, and Debra unfailingly demonstrated the importance of a strong work ethic through their tireless efforts on behalf of their family at work and at home.

Based in Naugatuck, CT, the foundation provides assistance to high-achieving college students who encounter unexpected hardships and subsequently need financial help to continue their education. This support has been essential for countless students who deserve to finish their degrees, regardless of any obstacles they have encountered.

Now, as COVID-19 poses unprecedented health and financial challenges in Connecticut and across the globe, the Healy Foundation's work is more necessary than ever. It is critical that education remains equitable and accessible to everyone, and the foundation continues to uphold that mission, awarding scholarships to 11 new students this year.

Committed to furthering a family legacy by bolstering bright, deserving young scholars, the Healy Foundation sets a positive example of encouraging and advancing well-earned education. I applaud their accomplishments and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Healy Foundation on 10 years of helping others achieve their academic dreams. •

RECOGNIZING FRESCO FOODS, INC.

• Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on

Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. Today, I am delighted to recognize a small business that provides healthy prepackaged meals and fosters community development. This week, it is my privilege to honor Fresco Foods, Inc., of Tampa, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 2014, Rob and Tracy Povolny founded Fresco Foods in Tampa, FL. When Rob was laid off by a corporate food seller, he chose to pursue his goal of establishing a high-quality packaged food company. Using their savings, retirement, and some loans from friends and family, they rented space in an industrial kitchen to create their recipes. That December, they began selling their "Eat Fresco" meals at local mom-and-pop grocery stores. Their healthy, satisfying meals were an instant hit.

Six years later, Fresco Foods has grown into a thriving company with more than 120 employees. In 2017, a U.S. Small Business Administration 7(a) loan enabled Rob and Tracy to establish their own 12,000 square foot production facility, creating more than 100 jobs. Their ingredients are sourced from a local distributor, and their product packaging is eco-friendly. In 2018, Fresco Foods reached a major milestone when they began selling their products in a handful of Publix stores. Today, Fresco Foods stock their "Eat Fresco" prepared meals in all 1,252 Publix locations across seven States. Additionally, they are working to launch a prepackaged breakfast line later this year.

Together, Rob and Tracy have prioritized business mentorship and ensures Fresco Foods supports the community. Through podcasts and by conducting workshops, Rob and Tracy have shared their experiences, teaching entrepreneurship to future small business owners. Fresco Foods regularly donates to local organizations like Feeding Tampa Bay. They also work with Metropolitan Ministries to employ graduates of its culinary technical training program. For its success and innovation, Fresco Foods has been recognized by local media and business outlets, including the Tampa Bay Business Journal.

Like many Floridian small business, Fresco Foods jumped in to help their community during the coronavirus pandemic. As Florida went into lockdown, philanthropic organizations experienced a drop in donations as demand for their resources surged. Rob and Tracy donated hundreds of "Eat Fresco" meals to homeless shelters and domestic violence shelters in the Tampa area.

In April 2020, the U.S. Small Business Administration launched the Paycheck Protection Program, a small business relief program that I was proud to author. The PPP provides forgivable loans to impacted small businesses and

nonprofits who maintain their payroll during the COVID-19 pandemic. Rob and Tracy used their PPP loan, which Fresco Foods received in April, to keep all of their employees on payroll until Florida reopened.

Fresco Foods, Inc., is a notable example of how small businesses can achieve commercial success, and remain committed to investing in their communities. Congratulations to Rob, Tracy, and the entire team at Fresco Foods. I look forward to watching your continued growth in Florida and beyond.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:27 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 2193. An act to require the Administrator of General Services to issue guidance to clarify that Federal agencies may pay by charge card for the charging of Federal electric motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 3105. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 456 North Meridian Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, as the "Richard G. Lugar Post Office".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1668. An act to establish minimum security standards for Internet of Things devices owned or controlled by the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2246. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Cherokee Street in Brookhaven, Mississippi, as the "Deputy Donald William Durr, Corporal Zach Moak, and Patrolman James White Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 2575. An act to authorize an AI Center of Excellence within the General Services Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2969. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1401 1st Street North in Winter Haven, Florida, as the "Althea Margaret Daily Mills Post Office Building".

H.R. 3275. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 340 Wetmore Avenue in Grand River, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Andy 'Ace' Nowacki Post Office".

H.R. 3847. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 117 West Poythress Street in Hopewell, Virginia, as the "Reverend Curtis West Harris Post Office Building".

H.R. 3870. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 West 165th Street in New York, New York, as the "Normandia Maldonado Post Office Building".

H.R. 4034. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 602 Pacific Avenue in Bremerton, Washington, as the "John Henry Turpin Post Office Building".

H.R. 4200. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 321 South 1st Street in Montrose, Colorado, as the "Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office".

H.R. 4672. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 21701 Stevens Creek Boulevard in

Cupertino, California, as the "Petty Officer 2nd Class (SEAL) Matthew G. Axelson Post Office Building".

H.R. 4734. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 171 South Maple Street in Dana, Indiana, as the "Ernest 'Ernie' T. Pyle Post Office".

H.R. 4785. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1305 U.S. Highway 90 West in Castroville, Texas, as the "Lance Corporal Rhonald Dain Rairdan Post Office".

H.R. 4894. An act to amend the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, to require the budget justifications and appropriation requests of agencies be made publicly available.

H.R. 4975. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1201 Sycamore Square Drive in Midlothian, Virginia, as the "Dorothy Braden Bruce Post Office Building".

H.R. 5062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9930 Conroy Windermere Road in Windermere, Florida, as the "Officer Robert German Post Office Building".

H.R. 5317. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 315 Addicks Howell Road in Houston, Texas, as the "Deputy Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal Post Office Building".

H.R. 5384. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Crosby Street in Mansfield, Louisiana, as the "Dr. C.O. Simpkins, Sr., Post Office".

H.R. 5597. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 305 Northwest 5th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the "Clara Luper Post Office Building".

H.R. 6021. An act to amend the Small Business Act to ensure that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is eligible for certain Small Business Administration programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6078. An act to amend the Small Business Act to increase transparency and to enhance the use of microloans in rural areas, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6079. An act to amend the Small Business Act to optimize the operations of the microloan program, lower costs for small business concerns and intermediary participants in the program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6133. An act to reauthorize the State Trade Expansion Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 2246. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Cherokee Street in Brookhaven, Mississippi, as the "Deputy Donald William Durr, Corporal Zach Moak, and Patrolman James White Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2969. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1401 1st Street North in Winter Haven, Florida, as the "Althea Margaret Daily Mills Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3275. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 340 Wetmore Avenue in Grand River, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Andy 'Ace' Nowacki Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3847. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 117 West Poythress Street in Hopewell, Virginia, as the "Reverend Curtis West Harris Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3870. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 West 165th Street in New York, New York, as the "Normandia Maldonado Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4034. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 602 Pacific Avenue in Bremerton, Washington, as the "John Henry Turpin Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4200. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 321 South 1st Street in Montrose, Colorado, as the "Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4672. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 21701 Stevens Creek Boulevard in Cupertino, California, as the "Petty Officer 2nd Class (SEAL) Matthew G. Axelson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4785. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1305 U.S. Highway 90 West in Castroville, Texas, as the "Lance Corporal Rhonald Dain Rairdan Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4975. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1201 Sycamore Square Drive in Midlothian, Virginia, as the "Dorothy Braden Bruce Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9930 Conroy Windermere Road in Windermere, Florida, as the "Officer Robert German Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5317. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 315 Addicks Howell Road in Houston, Texas, as the "Deputy Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5597. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 305 Northwest 5th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the "Clara Luper Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6021. An act to amend the Small Business Act to ensure that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is eligible for certain Small Business Administration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 6078. An act to amend the Small Business Act to increase transparency and to enhance the use of microloans in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 6079. An act to amend the Small Business Act to optimize the operations of the microloan program, lower costs for small business concerns and intermediary participants in the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 6133. An act to reauthorize the State Trade Expansion Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

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

H.R. 2575. An act to authorize an AI Center of Excellence within the General Services Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4734. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 171 South Maple Street in Dana, Indiana, as the "Ernest 'Ernie' T. Pyle Post Office".

H.R. 4894. An act to amend the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, to require the budget justifications and appropriation requests of agencies be made publicly available.

H.R. 5384. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Crosby Street in Mansfield, Louisiana, as the "Dr. C.O. Simpkins, Sr., Post Office".

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 4582. A bill to extend, temporarily, daylight saving time, and for other purposes.

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-5347. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule for Petition IN-11062, Deoxyribonucleic Acids (CAS Reg. No. 9007-49-2) for an Exemption Under 40 CFR 180.910" (FRL No. 1013-43-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5348. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pydiflumetofen; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 1012-18-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5349. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tiafenacil; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 10013-02-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5350. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "1-Octanamine, N, N-dimethyl-, N-oxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 10003-75-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5351. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Exec-

utive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts from sequestration for fiscal year 2021, if a sequestration is necessary; to the Committees on Appropriations; Armed Services; and the Budget.

EC-5352. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Antideficiency Act (ADA) Violations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-5353. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5354. A communication from the Congressional Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Paycheck Protection Program Lending Facility and Paycheck Protection Program Loans" (RIN7100-AF86) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5355. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Collective Investment Funds: Prior Notice Period for Withdrawals" (RIN1557-AE99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5356. A communication from the Congressional Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules Regarding Availability of Information" (RIN7100-AF51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5357. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Regulations and Legislation, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Housing Counseling Program: Revision of the Certification Timeline" (RIN2502-ZA34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5358. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Joint Statement on Enforcement of Bank Secrecy Act / Anti Money Laundering Requirements" received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5359. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Joint Statement on Enforcement of Bank Secrecy Act / Anti Money Laundering Requirements" received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5360. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit

Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule - Covered Broker-Dealer Provisions Under Title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act" (RIN3064-AE39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5361. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5362. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5363. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5364. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled "National Flood Insurance Program Affordability Proposal"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5365. 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 Emissions from Industrial Surface Coating Operations" (FRL No. 10014-32-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5366. 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; Restriction of Emission of Lead From Specific Lead Smelter-Refinery Installations" (FRL No. 10014-22-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5367. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Finding of Failure to Attain the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards; California; Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin" (FRL No. 10014-44-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5368. 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; South Carolina and Tennessee: Minimum Reporting Requirements in SIPs" (FRL No. 10014-35-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5369. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Definition of Chemical Process

Plants Under State Prevention of Significant Deterioration Regulations” (FRL No. 10014-28-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5370. 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; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the Morgan County Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area” (FRL No. 10014-25-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5371. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Coachella Valley; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements” (FRL No. 10014-24-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5372. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) Under the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)” (FRL No. 10014-11-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5373. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Repeal of State Regulations for Particulate Matter for Lime Manufacturing Plants” (FRL No. 10014-08-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5374. 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; Georgia; Emission Reduction Credits” (FRL No. 10013-73-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5375. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under the Clean Air Act; Final Action on Petitions for Reconsideration” (FRL No. 10013-31-OLEM) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5376. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Priorities List - List Sites” (FRL No. 10012-71-OLEM) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5377. 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; Idaho; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (FRL No. 10014-32-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5378. 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 Emissions from Industrial Surface Coating Operations” (FRL No. 10013-51-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5379. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Oregon Department of Environmental Quality; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills” (FRL No. 10011-40-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5380. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category - Reconsideration” (FRL No. 10014-41-OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5381. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 10013-77-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5382. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Kasugamycin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions” (FRL No. 10013-94-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5383. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Air Pollution Emission Notice Rules” (FRL No. 10013-30-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5384. A communication from the Supervisor of the Regulations and Dissemination Team, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Trade Adjustment Assistance for Workers” (RIN1205-AB78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5385. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report to Congress: State Submission of Annual Progress and Services Reports, Health Care Oversight and Coordination Plans Following Enactment of Pub. L. 115-123, the Family First Prevention Services Act”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5386. A communication from the Regulation Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System and Consolidated Billing for Skilled Nursing Facilities; Updates to the Value-Based Purchasing Program for Federal Fiscal Year 2021” ((RIN0938-AU13) (CMS-1737-F)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5387. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fiscal Year 2021 Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System - Rate Update (CMS-1731-F and CMS-1744-IFC)” (RIN0938-AU07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5388. A communication from the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Andean Trade Preference Act (ATPA): Impact on U.S. Industries and Consumers and on Drug Crop Eradication and Crop Substitution, 2019”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5389. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to extending and amending the agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Material from the Pre-Hispanic Cultures of the Republic of Nicaragua; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5390. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medicare and Medicaid Programs, Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA), and Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Additional Policy and Regulatory Revisions in Response to the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency (CMS-3401-IFC)” (RIN0938-AU33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5391. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Postmarketing Safety Reports for Approved New Animal Drugs; Electronic Submission Requirements” (RIN0910-AH51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5392. 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 "Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Chromium Propionate" (Docket No. FDA-2018-F-3347) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5393. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Basic Health Program; Federal Funding Methodology for Program Year 2021" (RIN0938-ZB56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5394. 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 during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5395. A communication from the Chief Privacy Officer and Chief FOIA Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from October 1, 2019, through March 31, 2020; to the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; and the Judiciary.

EC-5396. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Scheduling of Annual Leave for Employees Necessary to Respond to Certain National Emergencies" (RIN3206-AO04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5397. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-350, "New Hospital at St. Elizabeths Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5398. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-386, "Window Blind and Drape Cord Safety Notification Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5399. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-387, "Access to Biosimilars Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5400. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-388, "Hearing Aid Sales Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5401. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-389, "Pregnancy as a Qualifying Event Act of 2020"; to the Committee

on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5402. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-390, "Postpartum Coverage Expansion Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5403. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-349, "Connected Transport Network Temporary Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5404. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-391, "Black Lives Matter Plaza Designation Temporary Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5405. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-392, "Appraisal Management Company Regulation Temporary Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5406. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-394, "Investigating Maternal Mortalities Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5407. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-395, "Concealed Pistol Licensing Review Board Membership Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5408. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-396, "Commercial Insurance Claim Tolling Temporary Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5409. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-397, "Adams Morgan BID Tax Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5410. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-398, "Standby Guardian Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5411. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-400, "Reunion Square Tax Increment Financing Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5412. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-401, "Business Support Grants Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5413. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-402, "Performing Arts Promotion Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5414. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Colum-

bia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-393, "Criminal Justice Coordinating Council Information Sharing Temporary Amendment Act 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5415. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-399, "Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5416. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-408, "Fiscal Year 2021 Local Budget Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5417. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-407, "Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Support Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5418. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Temporary Changes to Requirements Affecting H-2A Nonimmigrants due to the COVID-19 National Emergency Partial Extension of Certain Flexibilities" (RIN1615-AC55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5419. 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 "Provider-Based Requirements" (RIN2900-AQ68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2020; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-5420. 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 "Specialty Education Loan Repayment Program" (RIN2900-AQ63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2020; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-5421. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Third Quarter of fiscal year 2020"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-5422. A communication from the Program Analyst, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, Report and Order" ((CG Docket No. 03-123) (FCC 20-105)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5423. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements 9.10, 911 Service" ((FCC 20-98) (PS Docket No. 07-114)) received during adjournment of the Senate in

the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5424. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishing the Digital Opportunity Data Collection, Second Report and Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" ((WC Docket No. 19-195) (FCC 20-94)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5425. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rates for Inmate Calling Services" ((WC Docket No. 12-375) (FCC 20-111)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5426. 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 "Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services - 2020 Update" (Docket No. EP 542) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5427. 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 "Market Dominance Streamlined Approach" (Docket No. EP 756) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 2502. A bill to ban the Federal procurement of certain drones and other unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-268).

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 332. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove the manifestation period required for the presumptions of service connection for chloracne, porphyria cutanea tarda, and acute and subacute peripheral neuropathy associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 514. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 629. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the processes and requirements of the Department of Veterans Affairs for scheduling appointments for health care and conducting consultations under the laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 711. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 805. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 2216. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and temporarily extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the family caregiver program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2558. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make certain grants to assist nursing homes for veterans located on tribal lands.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2950. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 3235. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program on posttraumatic growth, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3282. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the oversight of contracts awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3643. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize certain postgraduate health care employees and health professions trainees of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide treatment via telemedicine, and for other purposes.

S. 4384. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to address exposure by members of the Armed Forces to toxic substances at Karshi-Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Shon J. Manasco, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

*Michele A. Pearce, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army.

*John E. Whitley, of Virginia, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense.

*Liam P. Hardy, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces for the term of fifteen years to expire on the date prescribed by law.

*Lucas N. Polakowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Bradley D. Hansell, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Christopher G. Cavoli, to be General.

Space Force nomination of Lt. Gen. David D. Thompson, to be General.

Space Force nomination of Lt. Gen. David D. Thompson, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. David W. Allvin, to be General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Andrew P. Poppas, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. James J. Mings, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Lisa M. Franchetti, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Col. William F. McClintock, to be Brigadier General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Michael S. Groen, to be Lieutenant General.

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 nominations beginning with Brian H. Adams and ending with Mary Jean Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Air Force nomination of James E. Key III, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Paul Jeffrey Affleck and ending with Joseph F. Zingaro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 10, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Michael B. Parks, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Brian P. O'Connor, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Samuel P. Baxter, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Ryan M. Vanartsdalen, to be Major.

Army nomination of Mark J. Richardson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Luis O. Rodriguez, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Kyle C. Furfari, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Edward J. Coleman and ending with Michael E. Kelly, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nomination of Renn D. Polk, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with William R. Brown and ending with Paul S. Winterton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Jonathan Bender and ending with Christopher J. Vitale, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Raymond Colston, Jr. and ending with Matthew J. Rivas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with James O. Bowen and ending with Philip A. Winn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Andrew T. Conant and ending with Ravindra V. Wagh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nomination of Fred J. Grospin, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Matthew E. Tullia, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Anthony J. Bertoglio, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of John Stephens, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Angela M. Nelson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Luke D. Zumbusch, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Richard M. Rusnok, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Damon K. Burrows, to be Colonel.

Navy nomination of Brian F. O'Bannon, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Inaraquel Mirandavargas, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Kristen L. Kinner, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jeffrey B. Parks, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of William F. Blanton, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Michael J. Armstrong, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Chadwick G. Shroy, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Terrance L. Leighton III, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Todd D. Strong, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Nathan D. Huffaker, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Emily M. Benzer, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of David M. Lalanne, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Jean E. Knowles, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Kevin M. Ray, to be Commander.

Space Force nominations beginning with David L. Ransom and ending with James C. Kundert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 6, 2020.

Space Force nominations beginning with David R. Anderson and ending with Devin L. Zufelt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 6, 2020.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(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. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4569. A bill to modify the boundary of the Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4570. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to minimize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4571. A bill to extend certain deadlines for the 2020 decennial census; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 4572. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service connection for certain diseases associated with exposure to toxins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 4573. A bill to support remediation of illicit cross-border tunnels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4574. A bill to establish a demonstration program to provide integrated care for Medicare beneficiaries with end-stage renal disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 4575. A bill to ensure that the United States Government advocates for a free internet; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 4576. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to make a technical correction to ensure that the extended lease protections for servicemembers under stop movement orders in response to a local, national, or global emergency applies to members of the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating in the service of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 4577. A bill to require online enrollment for the PreCheck Program of the Transportation Security Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 4578. A bill to provide for domestic sourcing of personal protective equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. LOEFFLER, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 4579. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2020, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER (for herself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 4580. A bill to reauthorize the Act entitled "An Act to authorize funding to conduct a national training program for State and local prosecutors"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 4581. A bill to ensure the availability of mail collections boxes; to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 4582. A bill to extend, temporarily, daylight saving time, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 4583. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to Tourette syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. Res. 692. A resolution designating September 2020 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. Res. 693. A resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to implement an agenda to Transform, Heal, and Renew by Investing in a Vibrant Economy ("THRIVE"); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. Res. 694. A resolution recognizing 100 years of service by chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BENNET, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 695. A resolution designating September 2020 as "National Voting Rights Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 696. A resolution designating September 4, 2020, as "National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day", and raising awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROSEN,

Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Con. Res. 44. A concurrent resolution recognizing September 11, 2020, as “National Day of Service and Remembrance”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 463

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 463, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 624

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women’s Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the “Six Triple Eight”.

S. 739

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 739, a bill to protect the voting rights of Native American and Alaska Native voters.

S. 861

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 861, a bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBTI Peoples, and for other purposes.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 892, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as “Rosie the Riveter”, in recognition of their contribu-

tions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 1267

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1267, a bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes.

S. 1508

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1508, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America’s public safety officers.

S. 1687

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

At the request of Mrs. LOEFFLER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1687, *supra*.

S. 1791

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1791, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and marital status in the administration and provision of child welfare services, to improve safety, well-being, and permanency for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning foster youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1902

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1902, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety rule for free-standing clothing storage units to protect children from tip-over related death or injury, and for other purposes.

S. 2001

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2001, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O’Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Con-

gressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2226

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2226, a bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed and enacted into law by independent redistricting commissions, and for other purposes.

S. 2539

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

S. 2548

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2548, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 2669

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) 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. 3004

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3004, a bill to protect human rights and enhance opportunities for LGBTI people around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 3013

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3013, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow for the offering of additional prescription drug plans under Medicare part D.

S. 3419

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3419, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide for the establishment of a trust for the benefit of all unpaid cash sellers of livestock, and for other purposes.

S. 3485

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were

added as cosponsors of S. 3485, a bill to expand the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to expand revenue sharing for offshore wind, to reauthorize the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3547

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3547, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive limitations on expansion of facility capacity under rural provider and hospital exception to ownership or investment prohibition during coronavirus 2020 emergency period.

S. 3599

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 3599, a bill to enhance our Nation's nurse and physician workforce during the COVID-19 crisis by recapturing unused immigrant visas.

S. 3690

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3690, a bill to provide for E-Rate support for Wi-Fi hotspots, modems, routers, and connected devices during emergency periods relating to COVID-19, and for other purposes.

S. 3797

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3797, a bill to provide overtime and holiday fee relief for small meat, poultry, and egg processing plants, and for other purposes.

S. 3812

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

S. 3900

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3900, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a grant program to support science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps and for other purposes.

S. 3923

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3923, a bill to provide emergency relief to youth, children, and families experiencing homelessness, in light of the health and economic consequences of COVID-19.

S. 3986

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska

(Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3986, a bill to approve certain advanced biofuel registrations, to require the consideration of certain advanced biofuel pathways, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and for other purposes.

S. 4012

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4012, a bill to establish a \$120,000,000 Restaurant Revitalization Fund to provide structured relief to food service or drinking establishments through December 31, 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 4032

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4032, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow above-the-line deductions for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions.

S. 4150

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

S. 4166

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

S. 4227

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor 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. 4303

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4303, a bill to improve State short-term compensation programs, and for other purposes.

S. 4345

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 4404

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri

(Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4404, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Butterfield Overland National Historic Trail, and for other purposes.

S. 4458

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4458, a bill to grant the authority for States to enter into interstate compacts or agreements for the purpose of procuring COVID-19 tests.

S. 4565

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 4565, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to rename the Aviation Safety Whistleblower Investigation Office and to establish an Office of Professional Responsibility and an Office of the Ombudsman in the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 578

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 578, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 673

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 673, a resolution affirming that the New START Treaty extension will cover new deployed Russian nuclear delivery systems, and supporting additional initiatives to engage China that advance the goal of concluding an arms control treaty or agreement.

S. RES. 684

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1551

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1551 intended to be proposed to S. 2657, a bill to support innovation in advanced geothermal research and development, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 692—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2020 AS “NATIONAL PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. HAWLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 692

Whereas more than 3,100,000 men in the United States are living with prostate cancer;

Whereas 1 in 9 men in the United States will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in their lifetimes and 1 in 41 men in the United States will die from prostate cancer;

Whereas prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed non-skin cancer and the second-leading cause of cancer-related deaths among men in the United States;

Whereas the American Cancer Society estimates that, in 2020, 191,930 men will be diagnosed with, and more than 33,330 men will die of, prostate cancer;

Whereas 40.9 percent of newly diagnosed prostate cancer cases occur in men under the age of 65;

Whereas the odds of developing prostate cancer rise rapidly after age 50;

Whereas African-American men suffer from a prostate cancer incidence rate that is significantly higher than that of White men and have more than double the prostate cancer mortality rate than that of White men;

Whereas having a father or brother with prostate cancer more than doubles the risk of a man developing prostate cancer, with a higher risk for men who have a brother with the disease and the highest risk for men with several affected relatives;

Whereas screening by a digital rectal examination and a prostate-specific antigen blood test can detect the disease at the earlier, more treatable stages, which could increase the chances of survival for more than 5 years to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas only 31 percent of men survive more than 5 years if diagnosed with prostate cancer after the cancer has metastasized;

Whereas there are typically no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer in the early stages, making appropriate screening critical;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2020, the Director of the National Institutes of Health will support approximately \$287,000,000 in research projects focused specifically on prostate cancer;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2020, Congress appropriated \$110,000,000 for the Prostate Cancer Research Program of the Department of Defense;

Whereas ongoing research promises further improvements in prostate cancer prevention, early detection, and treatment; and

Whereas educating people in the United States, including health care providers, about prostate cancer and early detection strategies is crucial to saving the lives of men and preserving and protecting families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

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

(2) declares that steps should be taken—

(A) to raise awareness about the importance of screening methods for, and treatment of, prostate cancer;

(B) to encourage research—

(i) to improve screening and treatment for prostate cancer;

(ii) to discover the causes of prostate cancer; and

(iii) to develop a cure for prostate cancer; and

(C) to continue to consider ways to improve access to, and the quality of, health care services for detecting and treating prostate cancer; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interest groups, and affected persons—

(A) to promote awareness of prostate cancer;

(B) to take an active role in the fight to end the devastating effects of prostate cancer on individuals, families, and the economy; and

(C) to observe National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 693—RECOGNIZING THE DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO IMPLEMENT AN AGENDA TO TRANSFORM, HEAL, AND RENEW BY INVESTING IN A VIBRANT ECONOMY (“THRIVE”)

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 693

Whereas families and communities throughout the United States share similar hopes and dreams of a good life that is free from worry about meeting basic needs, with reliable and fulfilling work, a dignified and healthy standard of living, and the ability to enjoy time with loved ones;

Whereas the United States faces the stress of multiple, overlapping crises—old and new—that prevent the achievement of these fundamental human rights and needs, in which the COVID-19 pandemic has killed over 180,000 United States residents; tens of millions of United States workers remain unemployed; rising economic inequality has made working families vulnerable; tens of millions of individuals do not get the health care they need; and intensifying climate change increases the threats to our health, economy, and livelihoods;

Whereas these health, economic, and climate crises have magnified centuries-old injustices, causing high rates of death and hardship among Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities due to long-standing systemic racism—a fact spotlighted by an emerging, multiracial movement to end violence against Black people;

Whereas these crises are causing the inequitable workloads of women—particularly women of color—to grow, especially as women of color overwhelmingly make up the essential workforce, bearing the weight of the increased care needs of children, the elderly, and the sick;

Whereas, even before the COVID-19 crisis, many rural communities and independent family farmers suffered from poverty, declining economic opportunity, and alarming rates of farm bankruptcy, including loss of land from Black farmers and the exploitation of Black, Brown, and Indigenous farmers caused by predatory and racist public, private, and governmental institutions and policies;

Whereas the root of our interlocking economic and environmental crises is society’s

historical willingness to treat some communities and workers as disposable;

Whereas it is necessary to counteract systemic injustice and value the dignity of all individuals in order to address unemployment, pandemics, or climate change and ensure the survival of the Nation and the planet;

Whereas the choices made in response to these crises will shape the United States’ direction for the 21st century and beyond, offering an opportunity to reshape our society to provide a good life for each of us and for our children and grandchildren; and

Whereas the United States has the means to support fulfilling livelihoods for millions of people—Black, Indigenous, Brown, Latinx, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, immigrant, urban and rural, old and young, of many faiths, genders, abilities, and talents—while working to heal harms, protect communities, and invest in a future that fosters justice, not crisis: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is the duty of the Federal Government to respond to the crises of racial injustice, mass unemployment, a pandemic, and climate change with a bold and holistic national mobilization, an Agenda to Transform, Heal, and Renew by Investing in a Vibrant Economy (“THRIVE”) (referred to in this resolving clause as the “Agenda”), to build a society that enables—

(A) greater racial, economic, and gender justice;

(B) dignified work;

(C) healthy communities; and

(D) a stable climate; and

(2) such Agenda shall be assessed upon its ability to uphold its foundational pillars, including—

(A) creating millions of good, safe jobs with access to unions by—

(i) investing in projects including—

(I) upgrading our broken infrastructure to expand access to clean and affordable energy, transportation, high-speed broadband, and water, particularly for public systems;

(II) modernizing and retrofitting millions of homes, schools, offices, and industrial buildings to cut pollution and costs;

(III) investing in public health and care work, including by increasing jobs, protections, wages, and benefits for the historically unpaid and undervalued work of caring for children, the elderly, and the sick;

(IV) protecting and restoring wetlands, forests, and public lands, and cleaning up pollution in our communities;

(V) creating opportunities for family farmers and rural communities, including by untangling the hyper-consolidated food supply chain, bolstering regenerative agriculture, and investing in local and regional food systems that support farmers, agricultural workers, healthy soil, and climate resilience; and

(VI) developing and transforming the industrial base of the United States, while creating high-skill, high-wage manufacturing jobs across the country, including by expanding manufacturing of clean technologies, reducing industrial pollution, and prioritizing clean, domestic manufacturing for the aforementioned investments;

(ii) prioritizing the mobilization of direct public investments, while excluding false solutions that—

(I) increase inequality;

(II) privatize public lands, water, or nature;

(III) violate human rights;

(IV) expedite the destruction of ecosystems; or

(V) decrease union density or membership;

(iii) driving investment toward real full employment, where every individual who

wishes to work has a viable pathway to a meaningful and dignified job with the right to form a union, including by establishing new public employment programs, as necessary; and

(iv) subjecting each job created under this Agenda to high-road labor standards that—

(I) require family-sustaining wages and benefits, including child care support;

(II) ensure safe workplaces;

(III) protect the rights of workers to organize; and

(IV) prioritize the hiring of local workers to ensure wages stay within communities to stimulate economic activity;

(B) building the power of workers to fight inequality by—

(i) reversing the corporate erosion of workers' organizing rights and bargaining power so that millions of new clean energy jobs, as well as millions of existing low-wage jobs across the economy, become the family-supporting union jobs that everyone deserves, including by—

(I) passing the bipartisan Protecting the Right to Organize Act;

(II) repealing the ban on secondary boycotts;

(III) requiring employer neutrality with regard to union organizing;

(IV) ensuring that "franchising" and other corporate structures may not be used to hinder collective bargaining on a company-wide, regional, or national basis;

(V) advancing sectoral bargaining in certain economic sectors; and

(VI) ensuring that no workers are misclassified as "independent contractors;"

(ii) expanding union representation for all workers; and

(iii) creating ladders of opportunity, particularly for women and people of color, to access registered apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship programs in communities of all sizes across the country;

(C) investing in Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities to build power and counteract racial and gender injustice by—

(i) directing at least 40 percent of investments to communities that have been excluded, oppressed, and harmed by racist and unjust practices, including—

(I) communities of color;

(II) low-income communities;

(III) deindustrialized communities; and

(IV) communities facing environmental injustice;

(ii) ensuring that investments in these communities enable—

(I) the creation of good jobs with family-sustaining wages;

(II) economic ownership opportunities that close the racial wealth gap;

(III) pollution reduction;

(IV) climate resilience;

(V) small business support;

(VI) economic opportunities for independent family farmers and ranchers; and

(VII) the expansion of public services;

(iii) ensuring that affected communities have the power to democratically plan, implement, and administer these projects;

(iv) prioritizing local and equitable hiring and contracting that creates opportunities for—

(I) people of color;

(II) immigrants, regardless of immigration status;

(III) formerly incarcerated individuals;

(IV) women;

(V) LGBTQIAP+ individuals;

(VI) disabled and chronically ill individuals; and

(VII) marginalized communities; and

(v) providing access to quality workforce training, including through registered apprenticeships and pre-apprenticeships to ensure real pathways to good careers, including

those that have historically been inaccessible;

(D) strengthening and healing the nation-to-nation relationship with sovereign Native Nations, including by—

(i) making systemic changes in Federal policies to honor the environmental and social trust responsibilities to Native Nations and their Peoples, which are essential to tackling society's economic, environmental, and health crises;

(ii) strengthening Tribal sovereignty and enforcing Indian treaty rights by moving towards greater recognition and support of the inherent self-governance and sovereignty of these nations and their members; and

(iii) promulgating specific initiatives that reflect the nuanced relationships between the Native Nations, including—

(I) the confirmation by Congress that Tribal nations can exercise their full and inherent civil regulatory and adjudicatory authority over their own citizens, lands, and resources, and over activities within their Tribal lands;

(II) the codification of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent as it relates to Tribal consultation; and

(III) the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, without qualification;

(E) combating environmental injustice and ensuring healthy lives for all, including by—

(i) curtailing air, water, and land pollution from all sources;

(ii) removing health hazards from communities;

(iii) replacing lead pipes to ensure clean water is available to all;

(iv) remediating the cumulative health and environmental impacts of toxic pollution and climate change;

(v) ensuring that affected communities have equitable access to public health resources that have been systemically denied, which includes—

(I) upgrading unhealthy and overcrowded homes, public schools, and public hospitals;

(II) ensuring access to healthy food, mental health support, and restorative justice; and

(III) investing in universal childcare, care for individuals with disabilities, senior care, and a robust care workforce; and

(vi) focusing these initiatives in Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities that have endured disproportionately high death rates from COVID-19 due to higher exposure to air pollution and other cumulative health hazards as a result of decades of environmental racism;

(F) averting climate and environmental catastrophe, including by—

(i) contributing to a livable climate and environment for today and for future generations, including by—

(I) staying below 1.5 degrees Celsius of global warming;

(II) building climate resilience to keep communities safe; and

(III) ensuring sustainable resource use;

(ii) deploying investments and standards in the electricity, transportation, buildings, manufacturing, lands, and agricultural sectors to spur the largest expansion in history of clean, renewable energy, emissions reductions, climate resilience, and sustainable resource use;

(iii) transforming the power sector in order to move the country, by not later than 2035, to carbon pollution-free electricity that passes an environmental justice screen to prevent concentrating pollution in Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities;

(iv) prioritizing materials and parts that meet high labor, environmental, and human rights standards throughout the supply chain;

(v) supporting sustainable, domestic production of healthy, nutritious food that pays independent farmers and ranchers a fair price for their land stewardship; and

(vi) ensuring that funding under this Agenda goes to workers and communities affected by the economic and environmental crises, not to corporate fossil fuel polluters;

(G) ensuring fairness for workers and communities affected by economic transitions by—

(i) guaranteeing that workers and communities in industries and regions in economic transition due to COVID-19, climate change, and other economic shocks receive—

(I) stable wages and benefits, including full pension and healthcare;

(II) early retirement offerings;

(III) crisis and trauma support; and

(IV) equitable job placement; and

(ii) investing in transitioning areas to support—

(I) economic diversification;

(II) high quality job creation;

(III) community reinvestment;

(IV) retooling and conversion;

(V) reclamation and remediation of closed and abandoned facilities and sites;

(VI) child and adult care infrastructure; and

(VII) funding to shore up budget shortfalls in local and State governments; and

(H) reinvesting in public sector institutions that enable workers and communities to thrive by—

(i) rebuilding vital public services and strengthening social infrastructure in cities and counties, healthcare systems, schools, the postal service, and other services;

(ii) investing in equitable public education opportunities, including career and technical education pathways that prepare youth—especially girls; Black, Brown, and Indigenous students; students with disabilities; students from low-income families; and other students from marginalized groups—for high-quality jobs of the future, and state of the art technology and schools, so that from the beginning students are prepared to transform society and preserve democracy;

(iii) investing in the workers who provide care to children, the elderly, and communities burdened by neglect;

(iv) creating new public institutions, inspired by and improving upon New Deal-era institutions, to ensure universal access to critical resources and to strategically and coherently mobilize and channel investments, in line with the above priorities, at the scale and pace that these times require; and

(v) coupling this institutional renewal with democratic governance and accountability to correct the systemic misallocation of resources and representation that prevents families and communities from meeting fundamental human needs and pursuing fulfilling lives.

SENATE RESOLUTION 694—RECOGNIZING 100 YEARS OF SERVICE BY CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 694

Whereas, on May 18, 1920—
(1) Congress passed the Act of May 18, 1920 (41 Stat. 601; chapter 190), which blended the enlisted personnel of the Life-Saving Service

and the Revenue Cutter Service, the 2 precursors to the modern United States Coast Guard; and

(2) the United States Coast Guard issued General Order 43, which amended article 817 of the United States Coast Guard Headquarters Regulations to establish the non-commissioned United States Coast Guard rank of chief petty officer;

Whereas May 18, 2020, marked 100 years since the date of the establishment of the rank of chief petty officer in the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas individuals who are selected to serve in the esteemed position of chief petty officer in the United States Coast Guard must possess the highest standards of professionalism, technical expertise, and personal integrity;

Whereas chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard provide advice and assistance in matters affecting the enlisted members of the United States Coast Guard and their families; and

Whereas, for 100 years, chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard have—

(1) been examples of leadership, honor, and selfless service;

(2) freely accepted responsibility beyond the call of printed assignments; and

(3) through their actions, and the performance of their duties, gained the respect and admiration of their seniors and juniors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes 100 years of service by chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard; and

(2) honors past and present chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard, who have served in support of the safety, security, and stewardship of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 695—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2020 AS “NATIONAL VOTING RIGHTS MONTH”

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BENNET, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 695

Whereas voting is one of the single most important rights that can be exercised in a democracy;

Whereas, over the course of history, various voter suppression laws in the United States have hindered, and even prohibited, certain individuals and groups from exercising the right to vote;

Whereas, during the 19th and early 20th centuries, Native Americans and people who were born to United States citizens abroad, people who spoke a language other than English, and people who were formerly subjected to slavery were denied full citizenship and prevented from voting by English literacy tests;

Whereas, since the 1870s, minority groups such as African Americans in the South have suffered from the oppressive effects of Jim Crow laws that were designed to prevent political, economic, and social mobility;

Whereas African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and other underrepresented voters were subject

to violence, poll taxes, literacy tests, all-White primaries, property ownership tests, and grandfather clauses that were designed to suppress the right of those individuals to vote;

Whereas members of the aforementioned groups and others are currently, in some cases, subject to intimidation, voter roll purges, bans on former prisoners from voting, and financial barriers that act effectively as modern-day poll taxes;

Whereas, in 1965, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) to protect the right of African Americans and other traditionally disenfranchised groups to vote, among other reasons;

Whereas, in 2013, in the landmark case of *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), the Supreme Court of the United States invalidated section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, dismantling the preclearance formula provision in that Act that protected voters in States and localities that historically have suppressed the right of minorities to vote;

Whereas, since the invalidation of the preclearance formula provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, gerrymandered districts in many States have gone unchallenged and have become less likely to be invalidated by the courts;

Whereas these gerrymandered districts have been found to have discriminatory impacts on traditionally disenfranchised minorities through tactics that include “cracking”, diluting the voting power of minorities across many districts, and “packing” or concentrating minority voters’ power in one district to reduce their voting power in other districts;

Whereas the courts have found the congressional and, in some cases, State legislative district maps, in Texas, North Carolina, Florida, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Wisconsin to be gerrymandered districts that were created to favor some groups over others;

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), calls on Congress to update the formula in the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

Whereas some form of a restrictive voting law has been instituted in at least 23 States since 2013;

Whereas these restrictive voting laws encompass cutbacks in early voting, voter roll purges, placement of faulty equipment in minority communities, requirement of photo identification, and the elimination of same-day registration;

Whereas these policies could outright disenfranchise or make voting much more difficult for more than 80,000,000 minority, elderly, poor, and disabled voters, among other groups;

Whereas, in 2016, discriminatory laws in North Carolina, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and Texas were ruled to violate voters’ rights and overturned by the courts;

Whereas the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (referred to in this preamble as “COVID-19”) public health emergency has only exacerbated the state of elections and the difficulties voters face in obtaining access to the ballot;

Whereas a lack of fair and safe election policies threatens minority communities, which have been disproportionately impacted and disenfranchised due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and their access to the ballot;

Whereas addressing the challenges of administering upcoming elections in 2020 and beyond requires increasing the accessibility of vote-by-mail and other limited-contact options to ensure the protection of voters’ health and safety amid a global pandemic;

Whereas, as voting by mail becomes a safer and more accessible option for voters to ex-

ercise their constitutional right to vote during the unprecedented times caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the work of the United States Postal Service will be of paramount importance in successfully conducting elections;

Whereas Congress must work to combat any attempts to dismantle or underfund the United States Postal Service or obstruct the passage of the mail as blatant tactics of voter suppression and election interference;

Whereas there is much more work to be done to ensure all citizens of the United States have the right to vote through free, fair, and accessible elections;

Whereas National Voter Registration Day is September 22; and

Whereas September 2020 would be an appropriate month to designate as “National Voting Rights Month” and to ensure that, through the registration of voters and awareness of elections, the democracy of the United States includes all citizens of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2020 as “National Voting Rights Month”;

(2) encourages all people in the United States to uphold the right of every citizen to exercise the sacred and fundamental right to vote;

(3) commemorates—

(A) the 100th anniversary of Senate passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees women the right to vote; and

(B) the legacy of generations of suffragists who fought to protect women’s rights at the ballot;

(4) encourages Congress to pass—

(A) the For the People Act of 2019 (S. 949 and H.R. 1 of the 116th Congress), to increase voters’ access to the ballot, prohibit the use of deceptive practices to intimidate voters, end gerrymandering, create automatic voter registration, limit the power of restrictive voter identification laws, make critical investments in election infrastructure and technology, and address corruption in campaign finance and ethics;

(B) the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2020 (H.R. 4 of the 116th Congress) (introduced in the Senate as the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019 (S. 561 of the 116th Congress)), to restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) that prohibit discriminatory voting practices, remove barriers to voting, and provide protections for minority voters in States with a history of voting discrimination;

(C) the Natural Disaster and Emergency Ballot Act of 2020 (S. 4033 of the 116th Congress), to ensure that every eligible voter in the United States is able to exercise the right to vote safely and securely during a declared state of emergency by, among other things—

(i) guaranteeing no-excuse absentee voting;

(ii) expanding early voting;

(iii) providing self-sealing return envelopes with prepaid postage for—

(I) voter registration applications;

(II) absentee-ballot applications; and

(III) absentee ballots; and

(iv) providing accommodations for voters on Indian lands;

(D) the Delivering for America Act (S. 4527 and H.R. 8015 in the 116th Congress), to prohibit the United States Postal Service from making changes to operations or levels of service that would reduce those operations or levels of service relative to those that were in effect on January 1, 2020, establish requirements for the processing of election mail, and provide additional funding for the Postal Service Fund;

(E) the Securing America's Federal Elections Act, or the SAFE Act (S. 2238 of the 116th Congress), to provide funding for States to improve the administration of elections, including by enhancing technology and election security, replacing antiquated voting systems, and meeting new standards for administering elections; and

(F) other voting rights legislation that seeks to advance voting rights and protect elections in the United States;

(5) recommends that public schools and universities in the United States develop an academic curriculum that educates students about—

(A) the importance of voting, how to register to vote, where to vote, and the different forms of voting;

(B) the history of voter suppression in the United States before and after passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; and

(C) current measures that have been taken to restrict the vote;

(6) encourages the United States Postal Service to issue a special John R. Lewis stamp during the month of September—

(A) to honor the life and legacy of John R. Lewis in supporting voting rights; and

(B) to remind people in the United States that ordinary citizens risked their lives, marched, and participated in the great democracy of the United States so that all citizens would have the fundamental right to vote; and

(7) invites Congress to allocate the requisite funds for public service announcements on television, radio, newspapers, magazines, social media, billboards, buses, and other forms of media—

(A) to remind people in the United States when elections are being held;

(B) to share important registration deadlines; and

(C) to urge people to get out and vote.

SENATE RESOLUTION 696—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 4, 2020, AS “NATIONAL POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE AWARENESS DAY”, AND RAISING AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 696

Whereas designating September 4, 2020, as “National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day” will raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease, one of the most prevalent genetic kidney disorders, which affects approximately 500,000 people in the United States;

Whereas National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day will help to foster an understanding of the impact polycystic kidney disease has on individuals and their families;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease is a progressive, genetic disorder of the kidneys that causes damage to the kidneys and the cardiovascular, endocrine, hepatic, and gastrointestinal organ systems;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease affects the health and finances of individuals, and equally affects individuals of all ages, races, ethnicities, and sexes;

Whereas, of the individuals diagnosed with polycystic kidney disease, approximately 10 percent have no family history of the disease, with the disease developing as a spontaneous mutation;

Whereas there are very few treatments and no cure for polycystic kidney disease, which

is 1 of the 4 leading causes of kidney failure in the United States;

Whereas almost 50 percent of individuals with polycystic kidney disease experience kidney failure by age 60;

Whereas friends, loved ones, spouses, and caregivers of individuals with polycystic kidney disease can assist with the challenges created by polycystic kidney disease, including by helping such individuals maintain a healthy lifestyle and make regular visits to their health care providers;

Whereas the severity of the symptoms of polycystic kidney disease and limited public awareness of the disease may cause individuals to forego regular visits to their physicians or avoid following the health recommendations of their doctors, which experts suggest could help prevent further complications should kidney failure occur;

Whereas individuals who have chronic, life-threatening diseases like polycystic kidney disease may experience depression;

Whereas the PKD Foundation and its more than 35,000 patient and family advocates around the United States are dedicated to—

(1) conducting research to find treatments and a cure for polycystic kidney disease;

(2) fostering public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease;

(3) educating individuals and their families about the disease to improve their treatment and care; and

(4) providing support, including by sponsoring the annual “Walk for PKD”, to raise funds for polycystic kidney disease research, education, advocacy, and awareness; and

Whereas, on September 4, 2020, the PKD Foundation is partnering with sister organizations in Canada, Australia, and other countries to increase international awareness of polycystic kidney disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 4, 2020, as “National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day to raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease;

(3) recognizes the need for additional research to find a cure for polycystic kidney disease; and

(4) encourages all people in the United States and interested groups to support National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day through appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote public awareness of polycystic kidney disease and to foster an understanding of the impact of the disease on individuals and their families.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44—RECOGNIZING SEPTEMBER 11, 2020, AS “NATIONAL DAY OF SERVICE AND REMEMBRANCE”

Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mrs. MURRAY)) submitted the fol-

lowing concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 44

Whereas, on September 11, 2001, the United States endured violent terrorist attacks and events (referred to in this preamble as the “attacks”) in New York City, Washington, DC, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania, leading to the tragic deaths and injuries of thousands of innocent United States citizens and others from more than 90 different countries and territories;

Whereas, in response to the attacks, firefighters, uniformed officers, emergency medical technicians, physicians, nurses, military personnel, and other first responders immediately rose to service in the heroic attempt to save the lives of the individuals in danger;

Whereas, in the immediate aftermath of the attacks, thousands of recovery workers, including trades personnel, iron workers, equipment operators, and many others, joined with uniformed officers and military personnel to help search for and recover victims lost in the attacks;

Whereas, in the days, weeks, and months following the attacks, thousands of individuals in the United States spontaneously volunteered to help support rescue and recovery efforts, braving both physical and emotional hardship;

Whereas many first responders, rescue and recovery workers, volunteers, and survivors of the attacks continue to suffer from serious medical illnesses and emotional distress related to the physical and mental trauma of the attacks;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of brave individuals continue to serve every day, answering the call to duty as members of the Armed Forces, with some having given their lives or suffered injury—

(1) to defend the security of the United States; and

(2) to prevent further terrorist attacks;

Whereas people of the United States witnessed and endured the tragedy of September 11, 2001, and, in the immediate aftermath of the attacks, became unified under a remarkable spirit of service and compassion that inspired the people of the United States;

Whereas, in the years immediately following the attacks, there was a marked increase in volunteerism and national service among the people of the United States, which continues to this day;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed, and President Barack Obama signed, the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111-13; 123 Stat. 1460), which—

(1) established, at the request of the 9/11 community, Federal recognition of September 11 as a “National Day of Service and Remembrance” (commonly referred to as “9/11 Day”); and

(2) charged the Corporation for National and Community Service with leading that annual day of service;

Whereas, during the period beginning on the date of establishment of September 11 as a National Day of Service and Remembrance, millions of individuals in the United States observe that date by engaging in a wide range of service activities and private forms of prayer and remembrance;

Whereas, during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) national emergency—

(1) Americans have once again rallied together to rise to the challenge by caring for the sick, providing essential services, and volunteering in their communities; and

(2) there have been robust calls to strengthen, expand, and participate in all forms of national and community service; and

Whereas the trends described in the preceding clause are the continuation of an

American tradition of individuals and communities coming together to serve each other in times of need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes, commends, and honors the selfless dedication to fellow citizens displayed through the heroic actions of first responders and other citizens in New York City, Washington, DC, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania;

(2) calls on the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and all people of the United States, to observe September 11, 2020, as a “National Day of Service and Remembrance”, with appropriate and personal expressions of service and reflection, which may include performing good deeds, displaying the United States flag, participating in memorial and remembrance services, and safely engaging in volunteer service or other charitable activities—

(A) in honor of the individuals who lost their lives or were injured in the attacks of September 11, 2001; and

(B) in tribute to the individuals who rose to service—

(i) to come to the aid of those individuals in need; and

(ii) in defense of the United States; and

(3) urges all people of the United States to continue to live their lives throughout the year with the same spirit of unity, service, and compassion that was exhibited throughout the United States following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 4 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, September 15, 2020, at time to be determined, to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 15, 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, September 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

The Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights of the Committee on the Judici-

ary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4582

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4582) to extend, temporarily, daylight saving time, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading, but in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A REVISED AND UPDATED VERSION OF THE HOUSE DOCUMENT ENTITLED “WOMEN IN CONGRESS, 1917–2006”

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 92, which was received from the House.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 92) authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled “Women in Congress, 1917–2006”.

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 92) was agreed to.

NATIONAL POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 696, 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. 696) designating September 4, 2020, as “National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day”, and raising awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 696) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2020

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, September 16; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Robinson nomination under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:57 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 16, 2020, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 15, 2020:

THE JUDICIARY

MARK C. SCARSI, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

STANLEY BLUMENFELD, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

JOHN W. HOLCOMB, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.