

year's worth of experience as a district court judge, to sit on the second highest court in the country for the rest of his life. The temerity of doing that—he was on the court for just a few months, but he is friends with Leader McCONNELL, so he gets rushed to this very high court without the necessary experience and maturity of judgment.

The Republican Senate approved his nomination to the district court on October 24 last year, after the ABA rated him “not qualified.” Now, 8 months later, Leader McCONNELL wants to give Justin Walker, a former intern of his, a promotion to the DC Circuit.

Even in his extremely limited time as a jurist, Walker made news by calling the Supreme Court's decision to uphold our healthcare law “catastrophic” and “an indefensible decision.”

I would like Leader McCONNELL to go home to Kentucky and tell the citizens of Kentucky why he nominated someone who wants to repeal our healthcare law when the COVID crisis is hurting people there as it is everywhere else. In the middle of a national healthcare crisis, the Republican Senate majority is poised to confirm a judge who opposes our country's healthcare law.

There is no reason to do this nomination now. There is no stunning number of vacancies on the DC Circuit. We are in the middle of a global pandemic and a national conversation about racial justice and police reform. This is about the Republican leader and his relentless pursuit of a rightwing judiciary.

Usually my friends on the other side of the aisle vote in lockstep on these judges, so it is an indication of Mr. Walker's caliber, or lack thereof, that at least one Senate Republican has announced opposition to his nomination.

After Mr. Walker—again, before we move to policing reform—Leader McCONNELL will put forward the nomination of Mr. Cory Wilson to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Even by the very low standards of Trump's nominees to the Federal bench, Mr. Wilson is appalling. He called our Nation's healthcare law “illegitimate” and “perverse” and advocated the repeal of *Roe v. Wade*. Worse still, Mr. Wilson strongly supported restrictive voting measures, including voter ID laws and is opposed, in this day and age, to minority voting rights.

There will be a massive split screen in the Senate next week. As we prepare to debate legislation to reduce racial bias and discrimination in law enforcement, Senate Republicans will push a judge who has a history of fighting against minority voting rights. The hypocrisy is glaring. It is amazing to me—the temerity sometimes that the majority leader shows in talking about trying to bring racial justice and putting on the bench someone who has fought against racial justice in terms of voting rights throughout his career. Again, the hypocrisy is glaring.

CHINA

Madam President, now on China, my colleagues know how long I have

pressed administrations of both parties to be tougher on China's rapacious economic policies. For a time, I even praised our current President for talking about going after China's trade abuses, but, as on so many other issues, President Trump talks a big game and then completely folds.

After a few months of negotiation, President Trump announced his phase one trade deal with China, which lifted tariffs on Chinese imports in exchange for a few short-term agricultural purchases. It was clear at the time that President Trump sold out.

I argued strenuously with the Trade Representative, Mr. Lighthizer, about the phase one deal. And now, as excerpts of Mr. Bolton's book hits the press, we see why President Trump caved to China so completely.

The President's former National Security Advisor wrote that President Trump decided to drop all of our major demands on China because he wanted agricultural purchases from States that would aid his reelection. Mr. Bolton alleges that the President wanted the support of farmers in key States, so he sold out the national interest for his personal political interest. Does it sound familiar, my Senate Republican colleagues? Does it sound familiar?

Ironically, of course, American farmers aren't even getting the benefit because President Xi has reneged on purchasing American soybeans and wheat. When President Trump was so craven as to bring this up, it was a signal to Xi: You can stand strong, and the President will not do anything—will not do anything. And that is what happened, so no one won. American manufacturing and American jobs lost out in a weak-kneed deal with China, and then, even the farmers who were supposed to get benefit, of course, for Trump's political interests, didn't get any benefit.

While I would have preferred Mr. Bolton to have told these stories under oath at the impeachment trial, they are quite illuminating nonetheless. It seems he should have titled his book, “The Real Heart of the Deal.”

President Trump's failure to secure an end to China's predatory intellectual property theft is now explained. President Trump's ridiculous praise of how Xi handled the coronavirus is now explained. President Trump's silence on human rights abuses and the protests in Hong Kong is now explained.

Even more revolting, Mr. Bolton alleges that the President approved of President Xi's plan to place up to 1 million Uighurs into concentration camps—possibly the largest internment of religious or ethnic groups since World War II.

China is America's competitor to this generation and the next, and this President's insecurity, weakness, vanity, and obsessive self-interest is a threat—a real threat—to our economic security and our national security. President Trump cannot be trusted to deal with China policy any longer.

DACA

Madam President, before I yield the floor, I spoke earlier about the DACA decision and how I thought, first, of those wonderful kids and their families and the burden that is off their shoulders. But after a few minutes, I dialed my dear friend Senator DURBIN. He has waged this fight since, I believe—2002? Mr. DURBIN. 2000.

Mr. SCHUMER. 2000.

He has been passionate and unrelenting in fighting for the DACA kids and their families. He talks about it in our caucus every week. He did just this past week.

Now, while our work is still not done, we must all work so that these kids can eventually become American citizens. At least they are free—free at last—and, in good part, that is because of the work of the senior Senator from Illinois, who met them, got to know them and love them, and took his amazing legislative acumen to help them.

I believe, in part, that the decision across the street occurred because of Senator DURBIN's effective and unrelenting passionate advocacy for the DACA kids.

I yield the floor to my dear friend and a happy man this morning, the senior Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to thank my friend and colleague from both the House and the Senate, Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, for his kind words. He has been such a valuable ally in this battle.

As leader on the Senate side, CHUCK, I just can't thank you enough.

Mr. SCHUMER. DICK, the thanks goes to you. The thanks goes to you.

Mr. DURBIN. Time and again, we did things here that were difficult politically—difficult politically—to fight for the young people.

I just want to thank all of the Senators on both sides of the aisle who were a part of moving this issue forward. They did it at great political risk.

I can remember, as sure as I am standing here, watching one of my Democratic Senate colleagues walk down and vote for the Dream Act, return to her desk in the corner, put her head down and sobbed, realizing that she had probably cost her own reelection with that vote. Over and over again, people stood up for these young people.

This morning, minutes ago, the Supreme Court brought a smile and a sigh of relief to more than 700,000 young people in the United States of America. This morning, the Supreme Court ruled that the September 2017 rescission of the DACA Program by the Trump administration was to be stricken as arbitrary and capricious.

So what does it mean? It means, for these 700,000 DACA-protected individuals, that they can continue to live, to

work, and to study in America without fear of deportation for the moment.

DACA, of course, is a program created by President Obama in 2012. It was a program that was, frankly, our answer to the failure to enact the DREAM Act as the law of the land. The President used his Executive authority to create the DACA Program, and here is what it said, just basically mirroring the standards of the DREAM Act, which I introduced 20 years ago: If you were brought to America as a child, if you have lived in this country, gone to school, don't have a serious problem with the law, you should have a chance to live here without fear of deportation. The DREAM Act said you should have a chance to become a citizen of the United States, which is, of course, our ultimate goal.

But the DACA Program opened up eligibility, and almost 800,000 came forward and applied. They had to pay a filing fee of \$500 or \$600, go through a criminal background check, but for many of these young people, it was a turning point in their lives. At that point, finally—finally—there was a chance they could stay in the country they called home, the United States of America.

They seized that opportunity and did remarkable things. They enlisted in our military. They went to schools and colleges to pursue an education. They took up jobs as teachers. They finished medical school. They did things that were unimaginable for DACA.

Of course, when the administration changed and a new President came in, there was a real question as to whether he would continue the DACA Program.

The very first time I ever spoke to President Donald Trump was the day of his inauguration, within an hour or two after he was sworn, at a luncheon. What I said to him then—my first words were these: Mr. President, I hope you are going to help those young people, those Dreamers, those protected by DACA.

He looked at me, and he said: Senator, don't worry. We will take care of those kids.

Well, sadly, that didn't happen.

In September of 2017, there was a decision made by this administration to eliminate the DACA Program, and at that point, were it not for a court challenge and a protective order by the court, those young people might have been subject to deportation. But many, myself included, believed that the process used by President Trump was flawed, and, if challenged, it would fall in court. It took from September 2017 until today, just minutes ago, when the Supreme Court ruled that the administration's approach to eliminating DACA was wrong and would be stricken.

I want to say for a moment who these young people are, because many people don't know them. They don't wear badges or uniforms to claim that they are DACA-protected, but this is who they are. Of the 700,000, 200,000 of them

are essential employees. You may see them every day in many, many callings across America as we face this national health emergency.

Over 40,000 of them are healthcare workers. So if you are a patient at a clinic or a hospital today fighting COVID-19 and your doctor or nurse just walked in the room with a big smile, it is because the Supreme Court said to that healthcare worker or to that healthcare hero: You can stay in America. We need you.

Of course, that could change. I want to raise this issue because it is an important one. The Trump administration can decide that they are going to reinstate this effort to rescind DACA and try to do it right this time by the Supreme Court standards. That would be a terrible tragedy if he made that decision, not just for those 700,000 but for their families as well.

The front page story on the Chicago Tribune this morning was about just such a family, both husband and wife protected by DACA, working in America, trying to buy a little home in Aurora, IL. She works in a cancer clinic. He has a job as well. They have two beautiful little kids. They are both DACA-protected. Because of the Supreme Court decision, they have another day in America. They have a sigh of relief this morning, but what about next week? What will the Trump administration do to them next week? I am calling on the President and those around him, begging him to give these DACA protectees the rest of this year until next year at least before anything is considered. Let's protect them now through the election, and let the next President, whoever he may be, make a decision.

I hope before that happens we will do our part in the U.S. Senate, the second part of what we can and should be doing, calling on the President not to rescind DACA again, not to put these young people and their families through this all over again but, secondly, that we do our job in the Senate.

I listened to Senator MCCONNELL earlier, talking about bipartisanship and talking about our legislative accomplishments. He is correct that the lands bill we passed yesterday was historic. I am glad we did it. The coronavirus relief bill we passed is historic. I am certainly glad we did it on a bipartisan basis, and I sincerely hope, when it comes to Justice in Policing, we can do the same—a bipartisan effort to enact good law.

Let me add to the list, which unfortunately doesn't include a lot of legislation, something that is now critically important. The House of Representatives, months ago, passed the Dream and Promise Act, which would take care of the DACA issue once and for all. We could enact that law and say to these young people: Now you have your chance to stay and earn your path to citizenship in America. That is what we ought to be saying.

Everyone knows that our immigration laws are a mess. They are hard to explain and impossible to defend. We have a chance to do something about them on a bipartisan basis, and I am calling on Senator MCCONNELL and all the leaders on either side of the aisle: Let's join together and do that. Let's have a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Let's bring this bill to the floor of the Senate this year so that once and for all we can deal with the problem we have been looking at for 20 years and approaching in so many different ways.

In the meantime, for today—at least for this week and, I hope, for long beyond that—we will be celebrating a Supreme Court decision that gives a new lease on life to 700,000 young people who have one goal in mind: to be part of America's future. They were educated in our schools. They stood in those classrooms and pledged allegiance to the same flag we pledge allegiance to. They have their children. They have their families. They have their hopes and a future, and they are making a good living with life in the America. Thanks to the Supreme Court, they have some more time, but now it is up to the President and up to us to solve this problem once and for all, to do the right thing for them and for the future of America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DACA

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this morning we received news that the Supreme Court has ruled in regard to our Dreamers, our Deferred Action Childhood Arrival children, who came to America knowing no other country, and now the Court has said that President Obama did have the authority to establish the DACA Program and that President Trump does not have a basis in law for ending it.

Hundreds of thousands of Dreamers now have full legal authority to continue their lives in America—the country they know and love—and pursue their dreams, and we must celebrate that today.

EQUALITY ACT

Mr. President, I come to the floor on another issue of freedom. President Johnson said:

Freedom is a right to share, share fully and equally, in American society. . . . It is the right to be treated in every part of our national life as a person equal in dignity and promise to all others.

It was 1996 when Senator Ted Kennedy brought the issue of ending discrimination in employment to the floor of the Senate. In that year, not so