

work. On COVID, they have been providing food, clothing, and medical supplies. They are still doing the job training. They have been working on some mental health problems. They have helped with utilities. They have helped with rent, and they have helped with group homes.

Where is this happening? It is not just in Arizona, not just in Phoenix where it all started. It is happening in much of Arizona and in a lot of New Mexico. They are working with the Apaches and the Navajos. They are working against COVID in Mexico and in Africa. Yes, his school has expanded to Africa. They are in Ghana. They are in Cameroon. They are in Nigeria and in Liberia.

There are some good things happening in this world—people watching out for other people. It isn't government that has all the solutions. It is people caring about people.

I congratulate Dr. John David Arnold and his efforts following the blue bus and through these other iterations of education. I hope he is helping others with more on remote learning because that is where America is at the moment.

I thank you for the time.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROTECTING THE HEALTHCARE OF HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES AND PREVENTING EFFORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO ADVOCATE COURTS TO STRIKE DOWN THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 551, S. 4653, a bill to protect the healthcare of hundreds of millions of people of the United States and prevent efforts of the Department of Justice to advocate courts to strike down the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 551, S. 4653, a bill to protect the healthcare of hundreds of millions of people of the United States and prevent efforts of the Department of Justice to advocate courts to strike down the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 551, S. 4653, a bill to protect the healthcare of hundreds of millions of people of the United States and prevent efforts of the Department of Justice to advocate courts to strike down the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Tim Kaine, Martin Heinrich, Jack Reed, Jeff Merkley, Bernard Sanders, Jon Tester, Benjamin L. Cardin, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Angus S. King, Jr., Michael F. Bennet, Edward J. Markey, Chris Van Hollen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRUMP TAX RETURNS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, the New York Times' latest reporting tells us everything we need to know about why President Trump has worked so hard to conceal his tax returns from the American people. The President is a liar, a cheat, and a fraud. For years he marketed himself as a self-made, successful businessman, but it is all an illusion. Like the Wizard of Oz, behind the curtain is just a small, petty fraud.

He made millions playing a billionaire businessman on TV, but in real life, Donald Trump was racking up huge losses in debts that he then used to get out of paying his fair share of Federal taxes. Call it tax avoidance. Call it tax evasion. Call it whatever you want. The bottom line is that Trump is no business genius. He is a con artist who thinks that the rules don't apply to him.

The President managed to avoid paying any Federal income tax for 11 of 18 years, from 2000 to 2017, and then only paid \$750 in 2016 and 2017. When I first read that in the New York Times, I thought there must have been a typo. Surely there were zeros missing. I was wrong. The page read right. Our self-proclaimed billionaire President paid just \$750 in Federal income taxes—\$750. That is a heck of a lot less than what essential workers supporting America throughout this pandemic pay in taxes, like the grocery clerk in Newark, NJ, who makes \$11 an hour but owes about \$1,060 in Federal taxes—\$300 more than Donald Trump. How about the nurse in Hackensack, NJ, working nights to save patients with COVID-19, making \$60,000 a year. She owes about \$6,200 in

Federal income taxes—more than eight times what the President paid.

Most people would agree that is a problem with our economy. Americans are working harder than ever for less. They are drowning in skyrocketing healthcare, housing, childcare, and tuition bills. At the end of the day, many middle-class New Jersey families still find themselves owing money to Uncle Sam. Meanwhile, for rich people like Donald Trump, the tax rate is the lowest it has been in decades, and you can write off fancy haircuts and consulting fees paid to your own daughter and all the losses you racked up running your business into the ground.

I have to say, this is no surprise to most New Jerseyans. We watched in horror as Donald Trump ran his Atlantic City casinos into the ground, scamming hard-working contractors out of their pay and costing the local economy thousands of jobs. Donald Trump was like a reverse King Midas—everything he touched went bankrupt. Then after his string of bankruptcies and broken promises to workers, Trump turned around and got a \$72.9 million bailout from the IRS—you heard me right, a \$72.9 million bailout from the IRS. Most people I know think it is a good year when they get \$400 or \$500 back from the Federal Government; this scam artist got off with \$72.9 million.

Yet Donald Trump isn't swimming in cash; he is drowning in debt. The President is on the hook for approximately \$421 million in loans, more than \$300 million of that coming due in the next 4 years. To get out of the debt, the President is doing everything he can to profit off the Presidency. Over the last 4 years, he has continued to make money off foreign investments, rake in cash from special interests and foreign officials at his Washington hotel, and charge the Federal Government millions for the use of his properties. He could go anywhere. He could go to Camp David. No. He goes to his properties, where millions—Secret Service and other entities protect the President and help the President whenever he leaves Washington. But he is always at his properties.

In spite of all this revenue, Trump is still badly in debt. It is no surprise that intelligence experts are concerned about who is holding it. They worry about the President's personal exposure to foreign creditors and what that might mean for national security. Anyone else in that much debt to foreign entities would have their security clearances immediately revoked. Is this why Trump refuses to punish Putin for putting bounties on the heads of U.S. soldiers? Is this why he applauds dictators like Erdogan and sells out American allies like the Kurds? Is this why he applauds dictators like Philippines President Rodrigo Duterte for doing "an unbelievable job"?

The bottom line is this: Who does Donald Trump owe those hundreds of millions of dollars to, and how much do

they know about him and how deep are they into him?

For years, the President has fought to keep Americans in the dark. Well, now we know why. He is a liar, a fraud, and a failed businessman so deep in the red, he is a potential national security liability.

Let me close by quoting President Donald Trump in his own book, "The Art of the Deal." He said:

You can't con people, at least not for long. You can create excitement, you can do wonderful promotion and get all kinds of press, and you can throw in a little hyperbole. But if you don't deliver the goods, people will eventually catch on.

I only hope the American people are catching on.

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.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 552, H.R. 8337, a bill making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2021, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Richard C. Shelby, Lindsey Graham, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Tom Cotton, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Mike Crapo, Rob Portman, James E. Risch, John Hoeven.

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 H.R. 8337, a bill making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2021, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr.

SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 82, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 196 Leg.]

YEAS—82

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

NAYS—6

Cruz	Lee	Paul
Hawley	Loeffler	Toomey

NOT VOTING—12

Alexander	Harris	Sasse
Blackburn	Moran	Schatz
Blunt	Rubio	Tester
Coons	Sanders	Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 82, the nays are 6.

Three-fifths of the Senate duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the selection of the person to fill the Supreme Court vacancy is a historic moment in Washington. This is the seventh time that we will be in a position to at least meet someone who is aspiring to that position. I have had opportunities with each one of them to ask some questions before the formal hearing. I hope I have the same opportunity with the current nominee, Judge Amy Coney Barrett.

What is different about this particular moment is the fact that we know that there is an issue at stake here and one that is likely to be decided almost immediately by the new Supreme Court Justice. It is the only explanation I can find—perhaps one other—the only two explanations I can find as to why there is this hurry to fill this vacancy.

You see, it was 4 years ago, when there was a vacancy on the Supreme Court with Antonin Scalia's death—and that occurred on the February before the election—that Senator MCCONNELL, then the Republican Senate leader, argued there was no need to hurry. Why hurry about it? Leave the vacancy on the Supreme Court. Wait until after

the next Presidential election. Let the American people decide who will be filling that vacancy.

He made that argument, despite the clear history in this Chamber that did not support him, and he won the support of his position by every Republican Senator. They went so far as to say that if President Obama, in his last year in office, nominated someone to fill the Supreme Court vacancy, they wouldn't give that person a hearing.

Well, President Obama, in his last year of his Presidency, nominated Merrick Garland, a person who was widely respected as the chief judge in the DC Circuit Court—the second highest court in the land by some measure—and Merrick Garland came to Capitol Hill in the hopes that he would get his day in court, so to speak, in the Senate. But Senator MCCONNELL said: No way. Words out, Republican Senators, don't meet with him. A couple of them broke his rule and met with him anyway. But the word was out not to even give him the courtesy of a meeting 4 years ago. So Merrick Garland never had his day before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and his nomination departed with the Presidency of Barack Obama.

Senator MCCONNELL's new theory prevailed on how the Senate should treat Supreme Court vacancies. Every one of his soldiers on the Republican Senate marched in lock step with his theory. Well, guess what happened 4 years ago later. An incumbent President had a late vacancy on the Supreme Court with the untimely death of Ruth Bader Ginsburg, just a little over a week-and-a-half ago. And the obvious question to Senator MCCONNELL is: Will you be consistent now and say that that vacancy should not be filled until a new President is elected, and that President should have the option to fill it? And Senator MCCONNELL said: Of course not. It is not to my political advantage—he didn't add those words; I did—not to my political advantage. I am going to change this hard-and-fast rule of 4 years ago, and I am going to ask all of my Republican Senators to march before a camera and a microphone and to look down at their shoes and say the position they took 4 years ago, they are abandoning today. And all but two of them did it. All but two of them walked away from their pledge that they were under the old McConnell rule.

That McConnell rule was stated in just a few words. Here is what Senator MCCONNELL said 4 years ago:

The American people should have a voice in the selection of their next Supreme Court Justice. Therefore, this vacancy should not be filled until we have a new President.

The McConnell rule was thrown out just a few days ago. Why? Because it was to Senator MCCONNELL's advantage to fill this vacancy and to the President's and not to wait for the outcome of the November 3 election. So what is the issue? What would cause Senator MCCONNELL to change so quickly and

to ask all of his loyal Republican Senators to go through the embarrassment of recanting the position they took publicly 4 years ago? What is the big deal, Senator MCCONNELL? Well, it turns out we know what the big deal is. It is the Affordable Care Act. To paraphrase a Senator from Arkansas, Dale Bumpers, the Republicans and President Trump hate the Affordable Care Act like the devil hates holy water. They have tried every imaginable way to eliminate it, to change it, to water it down, and to discourage it. There were 50 different votes in the House of Representatives to eliminate the Affordable Care Act, and were it not for the Democrats in the Senate, they might have had some luck in doing that, but it didn't work. So they tried it on the Senate floor under reconciliation. They thought: Here is our chance. We just need a majority. We should be able to pull this one off.

And we had this historic moment just 3 years ago when, at 2:30 in the morning, John McCain came through those doors, and, with his "no" vote and the vote of two other Republican Senators, saved the Affordable Care Act. Imagine the frustration of MITCH MCCONNELL. Here was his moment to finally drive that dagger deep in the heart of the Affordable Care Act, and John McCain voted no. What was he going to do to get this job done?

Well, it turns out he figured he would get it done across the street in the U.S. Supreme Court. So 18 Republican State attorneys general filed a lawsuit to eliminate the Affordable Care Act. And then the Trump administration said: We are on board too. Let's get rid of it completely.

Off they went through the long treacherous journey in the courts all the way up to the Supreme Court across the street. Guess when the argument is scheduled to be heard. It is to be heard 7 days after the election. So you wonder why there is such a hurry to put another Supreme Court Justice on the Court who also opposes the Affordable Care Act? And make no mistake, President Trump made that one of the conditions of employment for anyone he would name to the Supreme Court. You have to be ready to march right in there and put an end to it.

So if we can vote under Senator MCCONNELL's timetable on or before the election, November 3, the new Supreme Court Justice sworn in, in her black robe, ascends to the bench in the Supreme Court on November 10, listens to the oral argument on the Affordable Care Act, and then a few weeks or months later puts an end to it. That is why we are in such a hurry, because if that Supreme Court vacancy is not filled by November 10, then whomever is chosen, as they do by tradition, could vote on the actual outcome of the case in the spring. That is what this is all about.

As someone told me long ago in this business of politics, there is always a good reason, and then there is always

the real reason. The real reason for the mad dash of the Senate Judiciary Committee to fill the Supreme Court vacancy, the real reason why Republican Senators are asked to march in lockstep and say that what they pledged 4 years ago meant nothing today—the real reason—is to put an end to the Affordable Care Act.

Let me tell the story, if I can, about the Affordable Care Act. I voted for it and am proud to have done it. Twenty million Americans have insurance because of it—600,000 in Illinois and, I might add, protections for people all across America. Let me discuss one of the protections of the Affordable Care Act that will go away and be eliminated if President Trump, the Republican Attorney General, and the Republican Senators who are supporting MITCH MCCONNELL have their way. Here is one of the provisions in the law.

Here is the story.

A couple of years ago, Tom from Palatine, IL, a suburb of Chicago, wrote to me about the Affordable Care Act. I will show a picture here. This is him. At the age of 30, Tom, married with dreams of fatherhood, was diagnosed with cancer, a tumor in his chest. He underwent 20 rounds of chemo and major surgery to remove the tumor. Thankfully, after that, he was cancer free.

There is Tom in his better days, racing to Wrigley. And there he is fighting his way through cancer in a hospital bed.

How much did it cost him for all of that care? Two million dollars. Two million dollars was the bill.

Before the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies imposed arbitrary annual and lifetime limits on how much they would actually reimburse a patient for medical bills. If you pass the limit, you are on the hook personally. That is why for years, medical debt was a leading cause of bankruptcy in America.

A fellow like Tom, racing along here, looking as healthy and fit as possible, ends up with a cancer diagnosis and goes through months and months of therapy and a bill of 2 million bucks, and the insurance company says: It is all yours. There is a limit in your policy.

That is the way it used to be before the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act put an end to those limits. Without those protections, Tom wrote to me and said that he "would most likely have capped [his] coverage and be bankrupt." It is pretty clear.

Thousands of other Americans could also be right there with him without the Affordable Care Act. Although Tom wants to continue working and contributing to society, he said he is scared to death. He is "terrified"—in his words—that protections for pre-existing conditions would be ended. You see, Tom having defeated surgery and declared this great victory—I am sure his friends and family couldn't be happier—is now branded by the insur-

ance companies as a man with a pre-existing condition.

In the old days, before the Affordable Care Act: Good luck, Tom. Good luck, because if you had a preexisting condition—and almost anything would count: acne, asthma, being a woman who might get pregnant, and on and on and on—you were subjected to higher premiums, maybe even no insurance at all. Those were the days before the Affordable Care Act.

Now, President Trump, the Republican attorneys general, and the Republicans in the Senate are dutybound to send a new Supreme Court Justice in to put an end to that protection, to put an end to the Affordable Care Act. They are so determined to get rid of ObamaCare at any cost that they could care less about Tom and people just like him with these lifetime limits.

If the Affordable Care Act is struck down, insurers could once again deny coverage to millions of Americans with preexisting conditions. That isn't all.

The Affordable Care Act also made it clear that if you are a family with a son or daughter who goes to college, comes out of school looking for a job, maybe had taken that gap year, maybe had taken an internship, but likely not to have health insurance, the Affordable Care Act says don't worry. Until that young man or young woman in your household reaches the age of 26, they can stay on your family's health insurance plan—a provision of the Affordable Care Act and a provision that a lot of families count on.

Our family needed something just like that when our daughter graduated college and didn't have health insurance and assured me that she sure didn't need it and she was so healthy. Well, that is scary talk for a parent to hear. But when it came to the Affordable Care Act, we would have been able to keep our young daughter under that policy—our family policy—for a period of time. The Republicans want that to go away—to go away with the Affordable Care Act.

You say to yourself: Well, clearly, Durbin, you are not telling the whole story. You are not telling us what the Republican plan is to replace the Affordable Care Act.

It is true—guilty as charged. I am not describing to you the Republican alternative to the Affordable Care Act because it doesn't exist. It does not exist. That is why John McCain and two other Republican Senators said: You can't eliminate the Affordable Care Act unless you have a replacement that is as good or better. Otherwise, too many American families will lose their insurance and lose their protection.

We had a hearing a few weeks ago, and I asked the leaders in the health community under the Trump administration the basic question: What have you heard about the Republican substitute for the Affordable Care Act? President Trump has told us over and over and over and over again that it is

just a week or two away. So what have you heard about preparedness?

They said: Nothing. We have heard nothing.

There is no Republican substitute for the Affordable Care Act. They are just dutybound to eliminate ObamaCare, and, sadly, the consequences would be awful.

That is what this is about. So if you think, I don't want to tune in to this whole debate about a new Supreme Court Justice from Indiana; I don't want to hear all these arguments because what difference does it make to me—if you are that person in America—I would say to you, please, take a look at what we are really facing here—an effort to fill a vacancy on the Supreme Court in a timely way to eliminate the Affordable Care Act. That is what this is all about.

Then, the President, just for good measure, tossed in another issue last week. How about this one—the first President in the history of the United States to not publicly declare that he would accept the outcome of an election? How about that? It is nothing short of a constitutional outrage that any President would say that. It is no surprise with this President because, when he was a candidate, he said basically the same thing: If it doesn't turn out that I win, then, I am not sure I want to live by the results.

He makes up these contrived arguments against paper ballots and how fraudulent they are. There are five States—five States in America—that use mail-in ballots exclusively. They include, of course, the State of Oregon, which might have been one of the first, and they include the State of Utah, as well, and Hawaii. Other States do it. How much fraud is there? Almost none. But that doesn't stop the President from claiming that mail-in ballots are fraudulent.

How does the President vote, incidentally? By mail-in ballot. What hypocrisy for him to make that kind of statement when he is casting his own vote with a mail-in ballot.

So now he said that he wants that Supreme Court vacancy filled: Do it now because I need nine Justices sitting on that Supreme Court if there is any election contest to follow.

It is pretty obvious what this is all about. The President needs a sure vote on the Supreme Court.

What a shame that we have reached this point, that we have denigrated the U.S. Senate to the point that we change the rules at our convenience, that we have reached the point where we are prepared to eliminate protections for 20 million Americans with nothing to replace it, and that we have reached a point where a President is so brazen as to say he wants to fill that spot on the Supreme Court just in case he runs into an election contest.

You would think there would be a chorus—a bipartisan chorus—of outrage for that statement by the President. Not so. There may have been oth-

ers—and I will scour the records to make sure—but two Republicans stepped up and said that the President's public statement on not abiding by election returns was terrible.

Who were those two? Senator MITT ROMNEY, here, the only Republican Senator I know of. If there were more, I will come back and correct the record. But I heard him clearly say that what the President said was intolerable. Then there was the Republican Governor of Massachusetts. I watched that press conference. He wasn't just declarative. He was upset to think that any President of either party would make that kind of statement. That is what we are up against.

Two weeks from yesterday, they want to hold a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee on this nominee, Judge Barrett, and they want the vote before the election, before the argument on the Affordable Care Act, and before the President faces any possibility of an election contest.

What a point we have reached in this country. The silence of Republicans across the Nation is deafening. They ignore the obvious.

You cannot have a viable, trustworthy democracy if you don't have viable, trustworthy elections, and in order to have that happen, you need Presidents of both political parties who are committed to fairness, committed to honesty, and committed to our Constitution.

Sadly, at this moment in time, we do not have a President who is, and there are too many of his own political party who stand back in the shadows in silence, recanting on pledges they made 4 years ago, doing whatever is necessary to win the favor of this President.

I hope another day will come soon with different leadership and a different view of this country. I am genuinely concerned about what we face on November 3 and the days that follow, but I have never given up on America, and I never will. I believe this democracy will prevail, and I hope that after he is gone, some Republicans will step forward and say: It is time to create a party not in his image.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 12 noon, Wednesday, September 30; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 8337; finally, that all

time during recess of the Senate and leader remarks count postcloture on H.R. 8337.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I was unable to attend the rollcall vote No. 184 on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Edward H. Meyers, of Washington, DC, to be judge of the Court of Federal Claims. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted to oppose cloture.

I was unable to attend the rollcall vote No. 185 on the motion to confirm the nomination of Edward H. Meyers, of Washington, DC, to be judge of the Court of Federal Claims. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted to oppose confirmation.

I was unable to attend the rollcall vote No. 186 on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Andrea R. Lucas, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted to oppose cloture.

I was unable to attend the rollcall vote No. 187 on the motion to confirm the nomination of Andrea R. Lucas to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted to oppose confirmation.

I was unable to attend the rollcall vote No. 188 on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Keith Sonderling to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted to oppose cloture.

I was unable to attend the rollcall vote No. 189 on the motion to confirm the nomination of Keith Sonderling to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted to oppose confirmation.

NATIONAL BLACK BUSINESS MONTH

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the great work of the Georgia Greater Black Chamber of Commerce. The Georgia Greater Black Chamber has focused on recognizing the integral contributions of Black-owned businesses to the strength of both our State and our Nation's economy during National Black Business Month in August. For 7 straight years, Georgia has been named the No. 1 place in the country in which to do business, and the Georgia Greater Black Chamber has been instrumental in making that possible.

As I mentioned, August was National Black Business Month, and the Georgia Greater Black Chamber celebrated by honoring an important Georgian: Mr. Herman J. Russell.