

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

Eric Garner. It would also ban no-knock warrants like the one the police used when they killed Breonna Taylor in her own bed.

Choke holds pose an unacceptable risk, and that risk is not borne equally. Black men are nearly three times more likely to be killed by police use of force than White men.

The use of no-knock warrants also disproportionately harms communities of color. The practice was popularized in the 1990s as a tool in the war on drugs so that officers pursuing drug charges could enter a person's home unannounced, with guns drawn, inherently and unnecessarily endangering their lives.

Communities and activists have been warning us about the inherent danger and injustice of choke holds and no-knock warrants for decades. It is long past time to end the debate and to ban these practices nationally, but experience has shown us that it is not enough to ban egregious practices. When Los Angeles banned choke holds in 1982, officers took up batons to beat and subdue civilians.

In 1991, the officers who beat Rodney King actually argued that their actions were necessary because they weren't permitted to use a choke hold, and those officers were never held fully accountable.

American policing resists reform and accountability, so it is not enough for us to ban the most dangerous practices; we need to set a national standard for police use of force. That is what the Justice in Policing Act does.

Today, the current standard in law asks only if an officer's use of force was reasonable, and this makes it nearly impossible to hold officers accountable because the system—a system designed to protect officers, not Black and Brown bodies—has built up decades of precedent excusing officers from the harm that they cause. So if we are serious when we say that Black lives matter, if we are serious about our commitment to equal justice, we need to hold police officers to a higher standard of care in their use of force. That is why the Justice in Policing Act would set a national use of force standard that asks whether the force was necessary and hold officers accountable for exhausting other options before resorting to violence.

The Justice in Policing Act would eliminate qualified immunity for law enforcement officers and reset the impossibly high standard for convicting law enforcement officers of a crime. Today, our system effectively puts cops above the law by insulating them from civil and criminal liability when they violate the rights of those who they are sworn to serve. No one should be shielded from accountability for their actions in a free society.

When we change these rules, we will finally be able to provide long denied justice for victims of police brutality, their families, and their communities. But we will also be able to prevent such brutality in the first place.

When law enforcement officers believe that they will never face consequences for crossing the line, they will continue to ignore that line. The Justice in Policing Act will begin to make this change.

The House is poised to pass the Justice in Policing Act next week, and I urge this Senate to take it up. Let's debate it, and let's pass it.

We are at a crossroad, and we cannot fail to act. Four hundred years of structural racism cannot be erased by a single piece of legislation or with a single generation of legislators, but passing this bill is a crucial step toward ending the killing and the violence against communities of color. It is a necessary step on the path toward racial justice.

The path toward justice leads us toward transformative changes to redefining the role of policing in America. Reimagining policing means recognizing that not every social ill and every emergency is answered by calling in the armed officers. We have other better and more effective tools when dealing with the hurt of mental illness, of substance abuse, of homelessness, of economic insecurity. Reimagining policing means asking whether outfitting officers with military-grade weapons and equipment makes it safer—or does it escalate conflict and violence and encourage officers to see the communities they serve as hostile enemies?

Reimagining policing means addressing the overpolicing of communities of color. It means that we ask questions about whether anyone is really safer when we surveil neighborhoods, searching for possible violations. This only feeds the system of mass incarceration.

Reimagining policing means that we reassess our criminal code, our justice system, and our sentencing laws that irrevocably disrupt lives and communities for minor offenses with minimal impacts on public safety.

Above all, reimagining policing means recognizing that our current system is not inevitable; it is the result of thousands and thousands of policy choices made over, literally, hundreds of years, designed to control and punish Black and Brown and indigenous communities—choices that compound injustice and unequal opportunity.

As we imagine a new way forward, we need to face some uncomfortable truths about the history of policing in our country. We can, and we must, make different choices this time. We know better, and we have to do better.

I want to close by thanking the community leaders and young activists who are showing us the path forward. This path requires us to be courageous. It requires us to be humble. It requires us to be uncomfortable. It requires us to listen. But it is a path rooted in love and in trust and in hope.

I am committed to walking this path with my constituents, and I am hopeful that my colleagues and my fellow American citizens will join me.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

TELEHEALTH

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, it is hard to think of much good that has come out of the 3-month experience with COVID-19, but here is one thing: the number of patients who have seen their doctors remotely through the internet, FaceTime, and all of the other remote technologies we have, including the telephone. We call that telehealth.

Our Health Committee this morning had a fascinating hearing on telehealth. There was a lot of bipartisan interest from the Senators—Democrat and Republican Senators. The Senator from Minnesota was the ranking member of the committee today at the request of Senator MURRAY. My sense at the end of the hearing was that there were a number of things we agreed on.

I ask unanimous consent that my opening statement at the hearing today be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

My colleague, the Senator from Tennessee who is presiding today, and I both know Tim Adams, who is the CEO of the Saint Thomas hospital system in Middle Tennessee.

He told me on the phone last week that Saint Thomas employs about 800 physicians in its several hospitals. During the month of February, there were 60,000 visits between physicians and patients in the Saint Thomas system. Only 50 of those 60,000 were by telehealth, were remote. But during the 2 months of March and April, Ascension Saint Thomas conducted more than 30,000 telehealth visits. That is 50 to 30,000—more than 45 percent of all of the visits between patients and doctors during that time.

Tim Adams expects that to level off, but there will still be probably 15 to 20 percent of all of Saint Thomas 60,000 visits a month by telehealth.

I talked to the CEO of the largest hospital in San Francisco a few weeks ago, and he said that during February, about 5 percent of their visits between doctors and patients were telehealth. He said that was a very high percentage for a hospital. But in March, it was more than half, more than 50 percent.

Think about that for just a moment. There were 884 million visits in 2016 between doctors and patients, according to the Centers for Disease Control. If 15 to 20 to 25 percent of those were suddenly by telehealth instead of in-office visits, that would mean hundreds of millions of visits a year would be by telehealth. It is hard for me to imagine that there has been a bigger change in the delivery of healthcare services in recent history or maybe in our country's history than the sudden shift to telehealth in visits between patients and doctors.

Telehealth has been around for a long time. Our witnesses testified to that. We had some excellent witnesses. Dr. Rheuban from the University of Virginia; Dr. Kvedar from Harvard, who is