

In Korea, their unemployment rate now is under 4 percent; our unemployment rate is somewhere between three and four times that.

That is clearly the incompetence—this is not a partisan statement. I have watched my Republican Governor of Ohio, who has done a good job, teamed up with Dr. Amy Acton, the health director, in combating this virus early, while the President of the United States was still blaming the virus on—saying it was a hoax or not real or whatever he said, and then his inept leadership didn't scale up testing, didn't have any national program to provide protective equipment to our people.

So we have seen the bungled leadership out of the White House—110,000 Americans passed away, an unemployment rate higher than at any time in my lifetime—but we are not doing anything about that here in this body. Why? Because Leader McCONNELL doesn't want to do anything about it, for whatever reason. Instead of rising to meet the crisis of the pandemic or unemployment or the protests on our streets, Senator McCONNELL wants to create a new crisis by confirming more extreme judges that are trying to take away America's healthcare.

The challenges we are facing as a country are bad enough. Imagine if Leader McCONNELL and President Trump get their way—their handpicked judges throw tens of millions of Americans off of their health insurance in the middle of a pandemic. That sounds farfetched? Well, no, it isn't.

In the middle of a pandemic, this President continues his lawsuit to try to overturn the Affordable Care Act, even though the voters have ratified it through a number of elections in 2012 and 2014 and 2016 and 2018. It still stands, but the President of the United States is trying to take away people's healthcare. They are trying to sneak ACA repeal through the courts since they couldn't do it in Congress.

While the rest of the country is distracted just trying to keep their families safe, judges are deciding the fate of America's health coverage right now.

The nomination we are considering this week—right now on the floor—of Judge Walker is part of that effort. Judge Walker has served in the Western District of Kentucky for just 6 months.

What makes him qualified for the DC Circuit? It is not the 6 months he served in Kentucky. In fact, the bar association in Kentucky said he wasn't qualified for that job. He has only had it for 6 months. What makes him qualified?

Just go down the hall. I am sure you could have seen many, many times Judge Walker when he was Law Clerk Walker or Young Man Walker or Grandson of Contributor Walker going in and out of Senator McCONNELL's office. He is a protege of McCONNELL's. He thinks the way McCONNELL thinks; he acts the way McCONNELL acts; and that is what it is all about.

Before his nomination to the district court, Walker praised then-Judge Kavanaugh for providing a roadmap the Supreme Court could use to strike down the ACA. So it isn't just that Judge Walker is a young, unqualified, extremist, far-right protege of the majority leader. It is not just that. I mean, talk about the swamp. That is what that is.

What it is all about is putting another vote in a key place to overturn the Affordable Care Act. He is calling upholding the ACA indefensible and catastrophic.

I don't know how, in the middle of a pandemic, you look at the American landscape, you see how many people have been sick—millions of Americans have been sick—110,000 Americans have died, hundreds more every day, and you think one of the most important things you can do is strip millions of Americans of their healthcare.

He has continued his attacks on American healthcare protections since he joined the Federal bench. In March 2020, at his formal swearing-in ceremony as district judge, Judge Walker said the worst words he heard while clerking for Justice Kennedy on the Supreme Court were the Chief Justice's rationale for upholding the ACA. The worst words he heard from the man for whom he was working were his words to uphold the ACA, the Affordable Care Act.

Now, what I forgot to mention was that when Judge Walker said that at his swearing-in ceremony, there were a couple of important visitors there.

Although the Senate should have been in session and finished our work on the first round of the coronavirus, Senator McCONNELL—his office is down the hall. As we know, Senator McCONNELL decided to adjourn the Senate and go back to Kentucky for this swearing-in. Judge Kavanaugh, another protege, if you will, of Senator McCONNELL's was there too.

So don't forget, Senator McCONNELL is on the ballot this year. Senator McCONNELL faces an opponent who is running neck and neck with him. It is a very Republican State, but Senator McCONNELL is not a particularly well-liked figure in his State, as we have seen through many years.

So Senator McCONNELL didn't do his job here. It is not just he didn't do his job. He stopped us from doing our jobs so he could fly back, be with Supreme Court Justice Kavanaugh, to remind the voters in Kentucky that he is the strong man who got Judge Kavanaugh on the Supreme Court and then to celebrate the swearing-in of just another young judge to a Federal district court. That is where Senator McCONNELL's priorities are.

We know Judge Walker is the latest in a long line of judges pushed by President Trump, rammed through by Leader McCONNELL, as his minions, shills, obedient junior Senators or sheep—you choose the noun for your colleagues—all vote yes so you could

put another member on another Federal court who is trying to take away Americans' healthcare.

Chad Readler, from my State, who is now serving on the Sixth Circuit, led the Trump administration's efforts to dismantle the entire Affordable Care Act, and David Porter, who holds a Pennsylvania seat on the Third Circuit, wrote that the ACA "violates the Framers' constitutional design."

What kind of law training do you have, and what kind of upbringing do you have—what kind of way do you think?—that you would think that providing healthcare to citizens is a violation of the Framers' constitutional design? Who thinks that way? On and on it goes.

The American people want to keep their healthcare. They have made that clear. They especially want to keep that healthcare in the middle of, for gosh sakes, a pandemic. Leader McCONNELL needs to stop trying to take it away through the courts and start letting us actually get to work to make people healthier.

Let's get to work to save lives from the coronavirus. Let's get to work to save lives from police violence. Let's get to work to save lives from all of the inequities in our healthcare system. Let's get to work to put money in people's pockets, help them pay the bills and stay in their homes, and help State and local governments from laying off thousands and thousands of workers.

Leader McCONNELL, let us do our job, the job for which we were elected.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—S. RES. 596
AND S. 3798

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about the death of democracy, and I am here today to talk about how we can stand with those who are fighting to preserve it.

In the United States, the death of democracy might seem like a distant and unfamiliar thing. We study examples in the history books. We read of nations and peoples who are forced, through no choice of their own, to surrender their basic liberties. We remind ourselves of the need always to stay vigilant, to stay aware, but we are seeing today the death of democracy unfold in realtime, right before our eyes, in the city of Hong Kong.

A diverse and global city, rich in culture and arts and commerce and people, Hong Kong is an outpost of liberty. For decades, under a special set of laws and protections, it has stood as a haven of liberty—a beacon, a light—but I fear that light is fast dimming, nearly overcome by darkness and by tyranny.

This body, along with all free peoples, has a special responsibility to take a stand for the freedom-loving people of Hong Kong. We must take a stand to ensure that the light of Hong Kong does not go out forever. We must take a stand to ensure that this outpost of liberty lives on. We must take

a stand so that the flame of freedom is not extinguished forever by the Chinese Communist Party.

On May 28, Beijing announced that it would adopt legislation that will essentially jettison the basic law under which Hong Kong has been governed for decades. It is legislation that will trample upon Beijing's own treaty commitments in the 1984 Sino-British Treaty, legislation—they call it legislation, but, of course, what it really is is just fiat, fiat by the Chinese Communist Party in Beijing—that will strip Hong Kong of its basic liberties, strip Hongkongers of the right to freedom of speech, strip Hongkongers of the right to peacefully assemble, strip Hongkongers of their rights to redress in fair and open courts with some process of law.

Beijing wants to deny the people of Hong Kong all of these things because liberty is a threat to the authoritarian Communist regime in Beijing. Oh, it fears the people. It fears the will of the people, and it fears the liberty of the people. It is trying to destroy the last outpost of liberty in its nation—the great city of Hong Kong.

Now, we were promised that it would not come to this. We were told, when China joined the World Trade Organization, when China was given permanent normal trade relations, when China was ushered into this so-called community of nations, that it would liberalize China and that it would make the Chinese Communist Party more moderate. Well, I think we know how that has turned out.

After decades now of stealing our jobs, decades of ripping us off in trade, decades of impoverishing our own workers here in this country while stealing our intellectual property, decades of building its military on the backs of our middle class and our working people, now Beijing wants to dominate its region, snuff out Hong Kong, and then turn to the rest of the world.

We have to send a clear message that we will not stand idly by. We will not allow Beijing to erase the history of its misdeeds. We will not allow it to erase the history of Tiananmen. We will not allow it to erase the history of the concentration camps it is running at this very moment, and we will not stand by while it destroys the liberties and the rights of the people of Hong Kong.

It is time now for this body to stand and send a clear message that will call the other free nations to stand in support of the values we hold dear, in support of all that this country stands for, in support of the liberty of the people of Hong Kong.

I yield to my colleague Senator BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for the work he is doing as he brings forward this resolution for Hong Kong.

I want to take just a couple of minutes to remind those of us who have been watching this issue and have concerns about this resolution that the aggression we are seeing now is not something that is new. This is newly realized.

As those of us who have followed this and followed the dealings of the Chinese Communist Party know, the newest so-called national security law is nothing more than the party's response to the threat that uprisings and protests in Hong Kong pose to its hold on power. It just can't stand it. It watches the freedom fighters in Hong Kong, and it thinks: What if it gets away from us?

Hong Kong is our financial center, and it is watching what is happening in the rest of the free world. Australia, Canada, and the UK all have signed the official joint statement with us, the United States of America, expressing deep concern with this so-called national security legislation, which really is the Communist Party's way of stepping into Hong Kong and usurping the power—of going back on a deal it made long ago.

Beijing claims that it needs this law to control against "subversion of state power," but, again, anyone who has been paying attention knows that it will use this standard as an excuse to redefine "subversion" and engage in the violent repression of speech, association, and movement—with no cause and without mercy. This is how it has kept control. It is a pattern, and there is no reason to believe it is going to do anything differently this time around.

Over the past year, we have seen how willing Chinese officials are to trample every international norm, every law, every principle of diplomacy to force their hand on their own people and on other countries. Now, against all odds, forces in Beijing have found a way to make life in Hong Kong more dangerous than it has been by delegitimizing peaceful and nonviolent protests and journalism that doesn't mirror party propaganda. They have seized even more hope away from the freedom fighters who have captured the world's attention in their stunning displays of defiance.

It is really quite a battle that is taking place, and I thank my colleagues for the good work they have done in standing against the Chinese Communist Party's aggression.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for her tremendous work on this issue. I thank her for her leadership and for her strong stance in favor of the people of Hong Kong and their basic liberties, guaranteed to them by the international treaty commitments that Beijing has ascribed to, that Beijing has signed up for, and that it now seeks to violate with impunity.

Let's be clear about what Beijing wants. It says that Hong Kong is its

plaything to do with as it chooses. That is not the case. Beijing has undertaken internationally binding commitments, agreements, by which it has agreed to protect and honor the basic liberties of the people of Hong Kong, and it is those commitments that it is seeking to violate today with impunity. It is those commitments Beijing is seeking to wriggle out of just as it has, time and again, violated its agreements with this country, just as it has, time and again, cheated on its obligations to Americans.

That is another reason I am calling on the Senate today to pass a resolution that makes it our position that China has gone too far. We must go on record and tell the world that this new national security law—this fiat that has been issued by Beijing—is a violation of what Beijing has committed to. It is a violation of the fundamental liberties of the people of Hong Kong, and nothing less than freedom is at stake.

My resolution also calls on this administration to use every diplomatic means available to stay Beijing's hand. The President has already begun the process of downgrading Hong Kong's special trade status. We must build on that effort now by rallying nations—the free nations of the world—to pressure China to back down from their attempt to strip away the basic liberties of the people of Hong Kong because, in the end, Hong Kong's struggle is the struggle of all free people.

Do you know what I said when I had the chance to visit the city, see the protests, and be out on the streets myself last fall? That sometimes the fate of one city defines the struggle of a generation. In the 1960s, that city was Berlin. Today, that city is Hong Kong, and it is time for this body to take a stand.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, as if in legislative session, I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 596. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I am reserving the right to object.

As I listened carefully to the statements made by the Senator from Missouri about the aggressive and unacceptable conduct of the Government of

China, or Hong Kong, he is absolutely right, I believe, that it is important that the U.S. Senate—in fact, that the U.S. Government take action strongly expressing our disapproval but also take action to actually show the Government of China that there will be a price to pay if they continue down that path of aggression and try to snuff out the freedoms of the people of Hong Kong.

That is why, immediately after the Government of China announced its intentions to move in that direction, we introduced a bipartisan bill. Senator TOOMEY introduced the bill. I am proud to join him as a cosponsor. We have other Democratic and Republican cosponsors to the bill. I am pleased to see the Senator from North Dakota on the floor. He is a cosponsor of that bill. It is called the Hong Kong Autonomy Act.

In addition to expressing the sentiments that the Senator from Missouri lays out in his Senate resolution, it proposes that we take action as the Government of the United States. While we have heard statements from Secretary Pompeo, the reality is that this administration has not exercised any of its existing sanctions authority that it could take to express our strong disapproval of the actions the Government of China is proposing to take with respect to Hong Kong. That is why we introduced the bipartisan bill, again, outlining all the transgressions the Senator from Missouri talked about but actually doing something about them by requiring that the administration impose sanctions on individuals in the Government of China who are undermining the rights of the people in Hong Kong and requiring them to impose sanctions on Chinese Government entities that are depriving the people of Hong Kong of the freedoms the Senator talked about. It goes beyond that. It says that any bank that is aiding and abetting the Government of China in snuffing out the rights of the people of Hong Kong can be subject to sanctions.

Now, I know the Senator from Missouri knows the Government of China well enough to understand that the Senate passing a resolution and leaving it at that is not going to change their conduct. I think the Senator is enough of a student of the Chinese Communist Government to recognize that. So that is exactly why we introduced this bipartisan legislation because if we want to have any chance of influencing the conduct of the Government of China, we have to make it clear there will be a price to pay. There is no price to be paid in the Senate passing a resolution. It is a nice statement. I support the statement, but I am also a little tired of this body passing a lot of resolutions, sometimes thinking we have actually done something when we haven't changed a thing.

That is why I am here on the Senate floor to ask my colleagues to support what is a bipartisan bill that actually

has some teeth in it. It is not just a statement from the Senate. It is an action that will be taken by the Senate and the House and, hopefully, by this administration, which apparently doesn't want to take action. We have heard them already express concerns about this legislation.

I would hope that if our colleagues on the Republican side feel as strongly as the Senator from Missouri does, they would want to back up those words with legislative action, and they would want to back up those words with something that is more meaningful and something that tells the Government of China that we stand together in making sure there is a price to pay.

I know the Senator from Missouri has worked on other bills making it clear that we do not find acceptable all sorts of conduct by China. I have as well—bipartisan bills. I hope we can join together right here, right now, to support the expression—the statement—that the Senator from Missouri has brought to us but also go beyond that and send a signal right now that we, the U.S. Senate, want to be joined by the House and by the administration in putting action behind those words. That is exactly what the bipartisan Hong Kong Autonomy Act does.

So I would respectfully request that the Senator from Missouri modify his request to ask, in addition to what he proposed, that the Banking Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 3798, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons involved in the erosion of certain obligations of China with respect to Hong Kong; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri so modify his request?

Mr. HAWLEY. I do.

Is there objection to the request as modified?

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, it is clear to the five or six of us Senators who are in the room right now that there is passion, that it is an important issue, and that there may even be unanimous consent in the hearts and minds, certainly, of the Senators with regard to both the spirit of the resolution and perhaps the letter of the bill, of which I am a cosponsor, that has been introduced by UC by the Senator from Maryland.

I think it is clear that we all have the same objective here, but I also know there is just a handful of us in the room talking about a very important issue that may seem simple but we know is very complicated.

We know that the administration has provided both technical and policy

views on the bill, and I think with such an important issue that so many of us care deeply about, it deserves a little more discussion and debate than just to come to the floor with a UC.

I am committed, as a member of the Banking Committee and as a cosponsor, to working with both committees and with the chairs of both committees of jurisdiction over the resolution and the bill to make sure we get it right as opposed to this UC.

I want to work hard. I know you all do. I think we should work at looking at the comments from the administration, working together as Republicans and Democrats who care about this country, care about the people of Hong Kong, and who are concerned about the behavior of China. So I object to adoption of this bill before we have a chance to do exactly that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, it has been a little bit over 3 weeks since my constituent, George Floyd, was murdered by the Minneapolis police, and for a little over 3 weeks, millions of people have marched on the streets, raising their voices in grief and anguish to protest the police brutality and systemic racism that killed George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, Philando Castile, Jamar Clark, and so many others. But the killing hasn't stopped.

Just last Friday, police in Atlanta killed Rayshard Brooks, shooting him twice in the back. Just moments ago, it was announced that this officer will be charged.

The killing will not stop until we take action. The Senate needs to act now to take up and pass the Justice in Policing Act.

I joined my colleagues, Senators BOOKER and HARRIS, in introducing this bill last week. I am grateful for their strong leadership toward creating a more fair and equitable justice system.

The scale of the injustice can feel overwhelming, and the path can seem very long, but passing the Justice in Policing Act would provide concrete steps on that path. It is a necessary step toward stopping the killing and advancing our work to make transformative changes that we need to fulfill the promise of freedom and equality in America.

The Justice in Policing Act would make some of the changes that we urgently need to stop the scourge of police violence against communities of color. This legislation would prohibit some of the most dangerous police practices. It would strictly limit the use of force, and it would begin holding law enforcement accountable in a system that was designed to shield them from accountability.

First, the bill prohibits the most dangerous police practices. It would ban the use of choke holds like the ones the police used to kill George Floyd and