



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 30, 2020

No. 135

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.

O God, our refuge and strength, give us reverence for Your greatness. Guide our Senators around the pitfalls of their work, enabling them to have hearts sustained by Your peace. May they surrender their will to You as they trust You to direct their steps.

Lord, remind them that leadership can work miracles with cooperation but rarely accomplishes much with conflict. Inspire our lawmakers to be quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to get angry. Help them to strive to live with such integrity that they give You the honor due Your 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 1 minute in morning business.

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

MOTORCOACH INDUSTRY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the motorcoach industry has been particularly hard hit by the COVID-19 pandemic and the economic turndown as a result of it. Iowa has many motorcoach operators, several of which are really family owned and some of them for two or three generations.

I have been in frequent communication with these Iowans, and I am learn-

ing they are quickly coming to the point of making a decision of whether they can even stay in business. Motorcoaches provide passenger transportation services to all Americans, providing over 600 million passenger trips annually across the country. By comparison, airlines provided service for 925 million passenger trips in 2019.

While most other modes of transportation received specific funding to help them through the pandemic, the motorcoach industry has not. What they are really referring to when they talk to me, they seem to feel that they have been left out when we have given several tens of millions of dollars to help the airline industry.

I spoke with Secretary Mnuchin about this matter and have relayed the concerns from these Iowa companies to relevant committees here in the Senate. The government relies on motorcoach industries to help move troops and also evacuate people to safety during our natural disasters. However, with passenger bookings being nonexistent and few charters being scheduled, this leaves little hope of rebound yet this year. The industry may not survive to provide this service in the future if they don't receive support.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on Monday, Senate Republicans released a starting proposal for another major pandemic rescue package.

This is what we want to do: Continue a Federal supplement to unemployment benefits that is otherwise about to expire; send thousands of dollars more in cash to American families; keep funding the Payroll Protection

Program to prevent more layoffs; subsidize rehiring to get laid-off workers their jobs back and create new incentives for workplace safety; give K-12 schools, colleges, and universities funding to reopen safely—more money than the House Democrats have proposed; support healthcare providers in the latest hotspots and keep supporting the race for vaccines; provide common-sense legal protection so that schools, hospitals, and other employers can reopen without being buried in lawsuits.

That is what we put forward—a trillion dollars for kids, jobs, and healthcare. It is a framework that is more generous in key areas than House Democrats' totally unserious proposal—a framework that could have kept the additional Federal payments to unemployed workers flowing instead of expiring this week.

There is a fact of life here in the Senate. It takes 60 votes to legislate, so the American people cannot get any of the additional relief that Republicans want to give them unless Democrats at least come to the table. Either our Democratic colleagues come to the table or the American people will not get the help they need. That is why I said this week we have come down to one key question: Will the country get the Democrats who showed up back in March to pass the bipartisan CARES Act or will the country get the Democrats who showed up in June to block police reform and keep that issue alive through November?

Unfortunately, 3 days in, it hasn't been a close call. The Speaker of the House and the Democratic leader refuse to let anyone else speak on their side. I understand the Democratic leader has actually forbidden—banned his own Democratic ranking members from talking and negotiating with their Republican counterparts who are spearheading the different components. You see, bipartisan, Member-level discussions might actually generate some progress, and progress does not appear

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4599

to be something the leaders on the other side want.

On Monday, the Speaker of the House claimed she could not wait to start negotiations, but then on Tuesday, she said her discussion with the administration “isn’t a negotiation.” And then the Speaker said: “The appropriate thing for the Senate to do is pass a bill and then we can negotiate with them.” Meanwhile, the Democratic leader is over here making sure that cannot happen. This is quite the partnership: the House Speaker moves the goalposts while the Democratic leader hides the football. They will not engage when the Trump administration tries to discuss our comprehensive plan. They will not engage when the Administration floats a narrower proposal. They, basically, will not engage, period.

The Speaker and the Democratic leader are playing rope-a-dope with the health, welfare, and livelihoods of American families. With benefits expiring, with the Paycheck Protection Program winding down, and millions unemployed, the Democrats are saying “my way or the highway” with a Socialist wish list that was laughed off by everyone from journalists to economists the instant they introduced it.

This is what reporters had to say about Speaker PELOSI’s proposal in May:

“The more than 1,800-page bill makes a long wish list for Democrats.”

“Neither this bill nor anything reassembling it will ever become law.”

Even the Speaker’s own Democratic Members knew it was a joke. “Privately, several House Democrats concede the bill feels more like an effort to appease the most liberal members of the caucus.”

Yet this is what they are holding out for. Let’s recall some of the specific items. These are the things over which Democrats are blowing up negotiations and forcing a lapse in extra unemployment benefits: tax increase on small businesses; taxpayer-funded checks for illegal immigrants; taxpayer-funded diversity studies of the legal pot industry; and their ongoing obsession with something called the State and local tax, or SALT, which would be a massive giveaway for high earners in blue States. In other words, a tax cut for high earners in blue States. Let me say that again. Democrats are holding up help for struggling people over special tax breaks for rich people in blue States, an idea that has been criticized by economists from all sides.

Republicans want to get more help to families right now, but Speaker PELOSI says: Let them eat SALT.

They also want to spend another trillion dollars bailing out State and local governments that only spent—listen to this—25 percent of the money we sent them back in March. Some State and local governments have only spent 25 percent of the money we sent them back in March, and the Speaker and Democratic leader want to send them another trillion dollars.

This is silly stuff. None of it should be stopping negotiations and none of it would be if our Democratic colleagues actually wanted to get an outcome.

Let’s talk about unemployment insurance. Both Republicans and Democrats agree in these extraordinary times it makes sense for the Federal Government to provide the stark additional help on top of normal unemployment. Republicans don’t want this aid to expire. Our plan continues it, but the Speaker and the Democratic leader say they will not agree to anything unless the program pays people more to stay home than to work.

Prominent Democrats have publicly said they agree with our position. The Democratic Governor of Connecticut says he wants to continue the benefit at a more targeted level. Multiple Members of the Senate and Speaker PELOSI’s own House Democratic Majority Leader have all said in the last few days that they are open to negotiating this, but the Speaker and the Democratic leader have cut all their colleagues out. They are standing alone, saying: “Our way or the highway.” And so people are going to suffer.

I understand the Democratic leader said he felt offended when I noted that some people are suggesting the Democrats’ strange behavior is explained by politics; that some people think Democrats are behaving like national suffering would only hurt President Trump. Now, the Democratic leader, himself, pointed that exact accusation at various Republicans during the Obama Presidency on multiple occasions. I know memories can be short around here when it is convenient.

More broadly, actions speak louder than words. Democrats spent weeks shouting that the Senate should act on police reform, but when Senator TIM SCOTT gave them the chance, they blocked action. They blocked the Senate from even taking up the subject. And now, so far, this is the sequel.

Democrats talked a big game about wanting to provide more assistance, but now that it is “go time,” they show zero appetite for any bipartisan outcome at all.

This is personal for me. Kentucky has not finished fighting with the coronavirus, and the Federal Government must not be finished helping Kentucky. Laid-off Kentuckians need more help. Kentucky schools need more help. Under our proposal, Kentucky alone would receive \$193 million for testing and contact tracing to fight the spread of the disease. This should be just as personal for every single Senator.

None of our States deserve the Democrats’ rope-a-dope. No American family deserves it. Don’t my distinguished ranking member colleagues wish they could be involved in robust bipartisan discussions with our chairman, like back in March, and not watching from the sidelines as their leader shuts down talks on TV? Do they really think the Democratic leader’s tactics are serving the common good of their States?

Republicans have put forward a framework that would do huge amounts of good for huge numbers of American families. If Democrats ever come to the table, we will be able to bridge our differences and make a law.

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 Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

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 Democratic leader is recognized.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE NOVEL CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate will soon acknowledge a moment of silence for the 150,000 Americans who have now died from COVID-19—more lives than our country lost in World War I. This national tragedy is more keenly felt because it has not and cannot be properly mourned. One of the most devastating consequences of this disease is that it keeps us apart even in death. There is no final clutching of the hand of a loved one, no funeral to remember one by. Grandchildren, wrapped in protective gear, wave goodbye from across the hospital room. There are 150,000 Americans who have died, which is more than in any other nation on God’s green Earth—more than of our allies and more than of our adversaries, more than in the most populous nations, more than in those with mere fractions of our wealth and power, and more—so many more—than in the nation from which this virus originated.

We will debate the reasons for this ugly truth—we must—if we are to avoid compounding our errors and heaping sorrow upon sorrow as the

virus continues to rage throughout our country. Yet now we spend a moment to acknowledge how much our country has suffered already.

We have lost friends and neighbors, brothers and sisters, fathers and daughters, mothers and sons, a beloved professor at Howard University, a civil rights pioneer, and a renowned psychiatrist. We have lost a Brooklyn doctor, at 62, on the verge of retirement, who in the early weeks of the crisis in New York, worked day shifts at the ICU and night shifts at the Hospital Center across the street before finally succumbing to the disease himself. We have lost so many in so short a time. Unable to grieve them in the manner they deserve, we respect this moment of silence, this moment of sorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a moment of silence to recognize the more than 150,000 American deaths from the novel coronavirus.

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

There will now be a moment of silence to recognize the American deaths from the novel coronavirus.

(Moment of silence.)

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, as COVID-19 continues to spread through dozens of States, our country is dealing with multiple crises at this time.

We learned today that the most recent quarter was the worst on record for our economy. The problem is not new or surprising. Millions of newly unemployed Americans cannot go back to work, cannot afford the rent, cannot put food on the table. Small businesses are waiting to see if the Federal loan program that kept them alive will be renewed. Parents are worried sick about their kids returning to school in the fall. The State and local governments that fought this disease on the frontline when the Trump administration refused to give them help are deep in the red and are slashing public services, teachers, firefighters, and more.

Throughout America, people wait days and days—even weeks—for the results of their tests, which renders the tests almost useless because we don't have an adequate testing program at the national level. This is the greatest public health challenge and crisis and the greatest economic challenge in at least 75 years. We need to confront all of these crises.

Senate Republicans hardly want to address any of them. They dithered for months and then produced a half-baked, halfhearted proposal of half measures—a proposal that their own caucus and their own President didn't fully support. Just last night, the Republican leader confirmed that 20 Republican Senators want to do nothing in the face of the historic problems we face, and because the Senate Republicans haven't gotten their act together, 2 weeks have now gone down the drain and 3 months went down the drain before that because the Republicans have been wedded to a twisted

ideology that the Federal Government shouldn't help people even in a time of national emergency.

As the country is about to careen over several cliffs as a result of Republican delay, dithering, and disunity, our friends on the other side are now scrambling. It is dawning on them now—not a week ago, not 3 weeks ago, not 2 months ago—that we are facing a cliff with unemployment—although we face cliffs on other issues, as well, right now.

I understand that, today, a few of my colleagues on the other side will ask the Senate to pass a reduction of the enhanced employment benefit from \$600 a week to \$200 a week or, even worse, a smaller percentage of a worker's wages than the Republicans proposed in their bill earlier this week. An already stingy Republican proposal has gotten even stingier as the week has gone on.

I have made it very clear why the proposal by the Senator of Wisconsin is terrible policy for four main reasons.

First and most obviously, it would hurt the unemployed as 1.4 million Americans filed new claims for unemployment last week, and the number is going up again. Our economy is still shedding jobs, and Americans are losing their paychecks through no fault of their own. Yet the Republicans want to take \$1,600 out of their pockets every single month. They want to give people who lost their jobs through no fault of their own a 34-percent pay cut. It is shocking, inhumane, wrong.

Second, it would exacerbate poverty. Our enhanced unemployment benefits have prevented nearly 12 million Americans from slipping into poverty. The Republicans want to slash and burn that poverty-preventing policy. Let's have more people go into poverty. That is what this amendment would do.

Third, it would devastate our economy. One of the few bright spots over the past few months has been consumer spending, in no small part because these unemployment benefits go to those Americans who need to spend them as soon as they get them. No wonder respected economic forecasters project that the Republican policy on unemployment insurance would cost us over a million jobs this year and 3 million more next year.

Finally, we know that this policy is impossible to implement. When our office called State unemployment offices to ask them about the Republican proposal, they said its implementation would be a catastrophe. One office simply said: "This would cause chaos."

This is not a serious proposal. We all know it will never pass the House and that it doesn't have enough votes to come close to passing in the Senate. Large numbers of Republicans will vote against it. This effort appears to be an effort to provide the Republicans some political cover because they can't get their act together and force the country over these cliffs.

We are trying to negotiate with the White House and would welcome nego-

tiations with our Senate colleagues, but the reason negotiations are going nowhere right now is that the Republicans are divided. Who is leading the effort on the Republican side—Chief of Staff Meadows and Secretary Mnuchin? Is Senator JOHNSON and Senator BRAUN's effort to pass reduced unemployment benefits a real offer from the Republicans or just a stunt?

Leader MCCONNELL has said that the Democrats will not engage. I would remind him that he refuses to go into the room when Speaker PELOSI, Secretary Mnuchin, Chief of Staff Meadows, and I sit in there. Once again, Senator MCCONNELL engages in "Alice in Wonderland" tactics and speeches and words. What he says is exactly the opposite of what is true. We are trying to negotiate, and the Senate Republicans are not.

Next, it is clear that the Senate Republicans don't have a unified position on anything. The main thing we hear from Leader MCCONNELL is that he would torpedo all of the relief that the Americans are counting on unless there is a giant corporate immunity provision attached, and he says he will not even negotiate on it. Who is holding things up? Who is standing in the way? Leader MCCONNELL and his Republican caucus are, certainly, at the top of the list.

And President Trump is all over the lot. He himself called the Republican Senate proposal "semi-irrelevant."

When your own President says your proposal is semi-irrelevant, as Trump has said to the Senate Republicans, you know that they are tied in a knot and can't get anything done.

The President seems to endorse a different policy every time he finds a microphone. The one thing we are sure he supports is spending taxpayer dollars on a new FBI building to boost the value of his hotel.

Yesterday, we learned the President asked for nearly \$400 million in renovations to the White House in the Republican COVID proposal. Seriously? The President proposes no help for Americans to stay in their houses but wants the taxpayers to fork over nearly \$400 million to help him renovate the White House?

Simply put, negotiations with the White House and Senate Republicans right now are like trying to nail Jell-O to the wall. We are trying to work with our counterparts, but it is immensely frustrating to deal with a negotiating partner who can't say what they support on nearly any issue.

Now, we are hearing the President and his representatives have floated the idea of a skinny bill to address one program, to extend unemployment insurance at much lower rates, which hurts the unemployed. But while the Nation waits, desperate for comprehensive relief, they leave everything else out.

What about improving testing, where people have to wait in line—wait for hours, days, and weeks to get their

tests back? What about helping State and local governments, who have to lay off firefighters and busdrivers? What about dealing with people who might be evicted? What about dealing with people who can't feed their kids? The list of issues goes on and on and on, and they are all immediate and urgent.

So to have this bill, which is inadequate on employment benefits alone—cuts them to the bone—and not include any of the other issues, in a hope to escape and then do nothing more? Forget it. It will not pass the Senate. It will not pass the House. It is a stunt.

Even if the White House would agree to another extension of enhanced unemployment at its current level, which many, if not most, Senate Republicans will refuse to support, there are just too many things left out—opening up our schools safely, healthcare testing and reducing the wait to get test results, State and local governments, so much more.

And even if the White House finally comes around to the position that we should extend the moratorium on evictions, that wouldn't be enough. It makes no sense to extend the moratorium on evictions without helping Americans actually afford the rent. We can prevent landlords or banks from kicking Americans out of their homes for another few months, but then what? The same Americans would be 6 months behind on the rent and have no hope of making up the difference.

So let's look. Here is where we are. Americans are worried as this awful pandemic rages on. The lifelines we passed here in Congress to protect families, small businesses, renters, school kids, and so many more are expired, and our Republican colleagues dither. We have a comprehensive, bold proposal. They have virtually nothing.

Let's remember recent history. That may give us some hope that we can get something done. Back in March and April, Republicans were late to the game, just as they are now, and proposed stingy, insufficient legislation in response to COVID-19, just like they are doing now. Each time, Democrats were not bullied by Republicans into passing something that wouldn't work and be insufficient, but we demanded that our colleagues sit down with us and negotiate a bill that meets the needs of the American people—and that is what we did.

In the second, third, and fourth phases of COVID relief, our negotiations produced much better legislation—legislation that passed both Houses with near unanimity. It is never easy, and it is never painless, but it can be done. We just need our Republican colleagues to get their act together, roll up their sleeves, understand the gravity and breadth and depth of this problem and negotiate with us in a serious way.

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

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

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, today our colleague John Lewis will be laid to rest. What an incredible legacy he leaves behind.

I was blessed to serve with him in the House of Representatives. The two of us were elected in the same class to start serving in the House of Representatives in 1987. We became friends, and he was certainly an inspiration to all of us.

I particularly mention his name today because of the challenges we are finding to our First Amendment right to peacefully protest. John Lewis frequently talked about "good trouble" and that all of us have a responsibility to speak out when we see something that is wrong and to do it in a peaceful way.

It is interesting that his last public appearance was with the protesters of Black Lives Matter here in DC, as he wanted to be there and was proud to see the diversity of the group who was there to protest the brutalities that we have seen in America and the systemic racism we see in our country.

We not only have the right but the responsibility to speak out when we see these injustices. The First Amendment to our Nation's Constitution is key to the foundation of our country's democracy, including the right of people to peacefully assemble and petition for redress of grievances.

The President of the United States ordering unidentified agents of the Department of Homeland Security to arrest and detain protesters is a flagrant breach of trust and potentially a violation of the law. Congress must speak up in a unified, bipartisan voice and tell the President that such an escalation and militarization of our city streets without provocation or invitation from local officials must stop and must stop now.

I am gravely concerned that when Federal law enforcement agents are deployed in this manner, their presence has increased tensions and caused more confrontation between demonstrators and police. Indeed, local, State, and even Federal officials—including the U.S. Attorney—have criticized the Federal agents' intervention and tactics in Portland.

I share the concerns of many of my colleagues regarding the misuse of resources and personnel, particularly when Federal law enforcement officers are used for political purposes by the President to violate the civil rights of our constituents. We all should be concerned that both the Justice and Homeland Security Departments are misusing their emergency authorities and are actually aggravating the situation in Portland and elsewhere.

I have cosponsored legislation that would place important limits and oversight on the use of Federal officers for enforcement operations and arrests relating to protests, including making sure that law enforcement officers are clearly identified.

I recently voted in the Senate to place further limits on the transfer of excess military equipment to State and local law enforcement agencies, and I will continue to demand that America reform its Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

After the shocking death of George Floyd in police custody in Minneapolis, Congress must address systemic racism and police brutality through passage of the Justice in Policing Act. While this legislation has passed the House, Senator MCCONNELL has still refused to bring it up in the Senate, condemning it to his legislative graveyard.

Now more than ever, we urgently need to rebuild trust with our communities and change the Trump administration's mentality from a warrior to a guardian approach for law enforcement.

News reports indicate that Federal law enforcement officers have been using unmarked vehicles to drive around downtown Portland and detain protesters since at least mid-July. In some cases, citizens could not tell the difference between law enforcement and far-right extremists in the region who wore similar military gear.

This reminds us of the most radical images that we have seen in authoritative, repressive regimes on how they violate the rights of their citizens.

Federal officials have been reported as grabbing Americans in the dark, not providing any form of identification, and arresting, searching, and detaining individuals in cells before properly reading their Miranda rights. There are widespread reports of Federal agents not having any probable cause before making these arrests.

Not only are these actions irresponsible and dangerous, it is a violation of our constitutional rights. America's strength is in the ideals that we believe in. We are the global leader in democratic values and the rule of law. These actions weaken our Nation, and these actions weaken America's credibility and global leadership on behalf of democratic values.

I am pleased that last week the inspectors general of the Department of Homeland Security and Justice agreed to investigate how their agents used force, detained people, and conducted themselves in confrontations with protesters both in Portland, OR, and Washington, DC.

Recall in Washington, DC, that Attorney General Barr used force to clear a peaceful protest at Lafayette Park just outside the White House. Attorney General Barr took this action so that the President could hold up a Bible for a photo-op outside of a church. This was an unacceptable breach of faith in the Constitution. It breaks the trust

between our law enforcement and our citizens.

Defending democracy and the rule of law—the very freedoms we as a nation hold so dear—is hard work. It is made harder when the very individuals sworn to uphold the law work so hard to undermine it.

The Justice Department is the only Cabinet agency named after an ideal, and Mr. BARR has forfeited his ability to effectively lead it.

In particular, the Justice Department inspector general will investigate how U.S. marshals have used force in Portland and how other parts of the Justice Department—such as the FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—were used in the Nation's Capital.

The inspector general of the Department of Homeland Security has said he opened an investigation into allegations that Customs and Border Protection agents improperly detained and transported protesters in Portland and that he would review the deployment of DHS's personnel in recent weeks.

America is not under siege, as the President would like citizens to believe—except by a President who freely uses aggressive law enforcement as a prop to distract the country from his flailing response to the pandemic that has crippled our Nation. Citizens are rightly concerned that the administration has deployed a secret police force, not to investigate crimes but to intimidate individuals it views as political adversaries.

Several former Secretaries of Homeland Security have sounded the alarm as well. Michael Chertoff, a Secretary of Homeland Security under George W. Bush, wrote recently:

The Trump administration's deliberate decision to intervene in the Portland protests with a heavy hand, unconventional means and inflammatory political rhetoric has contributed to growing public distrust—particularly of the Department of Homeland Security.

Critics of the department are now rightly worried that its law enforcement agents might be increasingly deployed by President Trump to score political points, or even interfere with the November election.

Secretary Chertoff concluded:

These actions, now or into the future, endanger our democracy and undermine the nation's safety—by hurting the department's ability to carry out its core mission of protecting Americans from genuine threats to our security.

Tom Ridge, the first Secretary of Homeland Security after its creation, said that the presence of Federal authorities in Portland, OR, as protests continue in the city, is not consistent with the Department of Homeland Security's mission. He noted that the first words of the Department's vision statement that he helped establish are “preserving our freedoms.”

Secretary Ridge continued:

When they appear to be quasi-military rather than law enforcement, I think it's like pouring a little bit of gasoline on the

fire. . . . Preserving the right to dissent is something very important.

Now, I know President Trump has threatened to send additional Federal officers to Baltimore and other cities to quell any further dissent or protests. Let me remind President Trump that the protests in Baltimore after the death of George Floyd in police custody have been peaceful, so we don't need additional Federal agents designed to crack down on free speech and peaceful protests, nor do we want Federal agents to come to Baltimore with the purpose of escalating tensions with the community or trying to provoke or incite violence or to discourage the lawful right of citizens exercising their First Amendment.

Instead, in Baltimore, we want to continue working cooperatively with our Federal partners, like our U.S. attorney, to address the stubborn problems involving drug gangs and the high violent crime and murder rate. Ensuring the safety of our communities requires an all-hands-on-deck approach. In Baltimore, we are using a task force known as the Baltimore Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force Strike Force, which is made up of local, State, and Federal partners. This task force only works due to continued transparency, collaboration, and engagement with the community throughout this process.

Together, the citizens of Baltimore will keep working with our law enforcement authorities to improve safety in our neighborhoods and on our streets. The city of Baltimore and the U.S. Department of Justice are continuing to work closely together, along with our U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, to fully implement a consent decree to bring constitutional policing to Baltimore residents so that the police adopt a guardian instead of a warrior approach.

Instead of spreading divisive rhetoric and taking escalatory actions against our citizens—tactics recently employed by President Trump—we should focus on working constructively at the Federal, State, and local level to promote proven strategies and solutions—like the strike force—that effectively reduce crime and improve safety.

I look forward to the findings and recommendations of the inspectors general of those two Departments to make clear what went wrong and to take steps to make sure this type of Federal law enforcement authority is never abused again in the future.

I would hope that all my colleagues would recognize the threat of these actions to the protections in the First Amendment of our Constitution, and we will work together as one body to protect the lawful rights of our citizens to protest their disagreements with government in a peaceful way.

With that, 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 bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TROOP WITHDRAWAL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. It is an awesome responsibility and assignment. We end up dealing with over 50 percent of the discretionary domestic spending each year in the United States. I work with my chairman, Senator SHELBY, and I have worked with others in the past trying to keep up with a changing environment in the world and a changing agenda in Washington. Many of the briefings I receive are open and public, and many are also classified.

Last week, I met with the top U.S. commander in Europe, General Tod Wolters. General Wolters provided for me and Senator SHELBY a classified briefing on the Trump administration's plans to remove almost 12,000 American troops from Germany. Yesterday, the Secretary of Defense, Mark Esper, made a similar briefing but publicly to the press.

I am extremely concerned by both the classified and unclassified information I have been given about this plan and by the differences in the briefing I received compared to the public announcements from the Secretary of Defense yesterday. Let me start off by saying that this plan makes no sense. While some are framing this as an improvement of our military posture in Europe, I don't buy it. Nobody else should either.

Germany now spends 1.3 percent of its gross domestic product on defense. Along with a majority of NATO members, Germany has agreed to reach a goal of 2 percent of GDP on defense. Germany ought to make good on its word; that is for sure. But to be clear, many, including President Trump, fail to appreciate that there is much more to NATO's importance than simply meeting a spending goal. In fact, there are many important ways to evaluate this historic NATO alliance and judge the commitment of each member, including the political will of its leaders, its shared vision and values, and the interoperability of our military through regular training. All of these things add to NATO's deterrence. But President Trump is clearly just using this argument about the percentage contribution and insufficient spending to drive a petty and personal grudge against Germany.

How do we know this? Because—listen to this—the countries that would be receiving our troops transferred out of Germany also do not meet the 2 percent goal.

President Trump was reportedly angry that German Chancellor Merkel declined an invitation for an in-person G7 summit in the United States in the middle of this global pandemic. Think

of that: She was worried about the health consequences of such a meeting. We are canceling gatherings right and left in America because of a genuine concern we have for the well-being of one another. Chancellor Merkel's position is hardly unreasonable. It makes sense. Many of the statements and conduct from the President Trump do not.

Amidst this snub to our NATO allies, President Trump continues to try to bring President Putin and Russia into the G7, even after reports about Russian bounties being put on American soldiers in Afghanistan and the President's failure time and again since this has been disclosed to raise the issue with Vladimir Putin.

During the briefing last week, I understood there would be a distributive process for planning how these troops would be moved and when they would be moved. We would discuss the infrastructure that needs to be built in the United States as well as in Europe, and we would be in close consultation with our allies in the process.

In contrast, the Vice Chairman of the Joints Chief of Staff, General Hyten, stated yesterday that there is a planning process occurring. He also went on to say that "we'll start moving right away with forces moving right away." Really? Without the planning? It sounds like this general is snapping to the attention of the President, who is determined to poke the German Chancellor in the eye. Shouldn't our highest priority be the defense of America rather than a spite match?

If I am confused about how quickly this plan has unfolded, I will bet the rest of our NATO allies are as well.

I might also say that I received a preliminary cost estimate on how much American taxpayers will have to pay for this political adventure by President Trump. This figure is still classified. I am sorry that it is, but I can assure you the costs are substantial. Secretary Esper was dismissive yesterday of its cost; he should not be. It is substantial.

Hiding the costs of this troop realignment plan brings to mind the President's campaign promise that Mexico was going to pay for our border wall. In reality, the Department of Defense paid for a large part of it because the President diverted funds appropriated for our national defense to this Captain Queeg venture of his on our southern border.

The Defense Department should make cost estimates of this plan public today. Let the American people know what the President expects us to spend in order for him to get the last word with Angela Merkel. The American people ought to decide for themselves whether this is a cost worth bearing.

Let me tell you what has been conspicuously absent from both public and private briefings, and that is whether our commitment to our real allies in Europe and NATO is really designed to address the frontline of potential Russian aggression and provocation. I

know what that frontline is, and most people do as well—the Baltics and Poland. Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Poland—here are four countries that have the most to lose if Putin chooses a path to war. Each of them meets and exceeds the spending goals for NATO. But this plan for the reallocation and reassignment of U.S. troops does not help these four countries.

I went through the briefing. Those four countries weren't raised in the briefing. I raised them in a question afterward: Why are these countries being overlooked if we are moving troops to make Europe safer? Instead, the Department of Defense yesterday threw in as an aside a vague assurance—maybe just a possibility—that sometime, maybe in the future, more American troops might rotate through those countries for short periods of time. Major parts of the plan that I saw and part of the plan that was released yesterday actually move American troops and NATO allies further away from Russia.

Vladimir Putin is getting the last laugh again when it comes to this President. Vladimir Putin fears a united NATO. Sadly, President Trump has done everything he can to divide and diminish that NATO alliance. President Putin believes that as long as that NATO alliance is divided, he is in a stronger bargaining position. Sadly, he is right.

NATO is the most successful alliance in American history. Instead of strengthening it, the President of the United States is weakening it. Instead of leading it, he is undermining it. The best way to reassure our allies that we are with them is to scrap this plan now.

If this administration is so confident about how good an idea this is, tell the American people how much it is going to cost and explain why we are not reallocating our forces in Europe to the real frontline in Poland and the Baltics. Instead of pulling back our troops, we should be withdrawing this half-baked plan and start over anew with a focus on stopping aggression from Vladimir Putin and standing behind our traditional allies.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF DEREK KAN

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the nomination of Derek Kan to serve as second in command at the Office of Management and Budget.

It is not every day that I stand here and endorse a nomination—a nominee—of a current President. So I don't want anybody to have a heart attack,

but I do want to stand up and say that this is a good nomination. I wish we had more like him. I am pleased that at least we have this one today to consider.

Derek Kan served previously as Under Secretary for Transportation Policy at the Department of Transportation, where he served as a principal adviser to the Secretary and provided leadership in the development of policies at the Department.

I have a couple of quotes here from two of my Democratic colleagues that referenced his time at the Department of Transportation. One of our Democratic colleagues from here in the Senate said these words: "Mr. Kan, from your time at the Department of Transportation, I know you to be a talented and thoughtful leader who can work collaboratively with Congress and others to find common ground."

Think about those words: "who can work collaboratively with Congress and others to find common ground."

Another of our Democratic colleagues said of Derek Kan: "Derek Kan is a serious, smart person and a vast improvement over the previously mentioned names."

That is a quote. I will say it again: "Derek Kan is a serious, smart person and a vast improvement over the previously mentioned names."

Now, that is not damning with faint praise. That is, I think, praise. I think it is well earned, and I just wanted to share that with you.

He has been nominated to serve by this administration in a number of positions, and he has gotten the support of Democrats and Republicans—not unanimous support. I wouldn't get unanimous support if I were nominated for something that came through here either—but he has gotten strong support, for the most part.

I was pleased to be able to vote in favor of his confirmation to this particular position. He was confirmed—at that time it was as the Department of Transportation Under Secretary, and I think he was confirmed in the Senate by a vote of 90 to 7.

Prior to this appointment, Mr. Kan served on the Amtrak board of directors, and he was unanimously confirmed to that position by this same body. He doesn't know this, but he and I have something in common. We were both confirmed—I was sitting Governor of Delaware, but I was confirmed to serve as the lone Governor at the time on Amtrak's board of directors. And I was confirmed unanimously. Somehow that slipped through. But that is something that he and I share in common, and he understands well the importance of the capacity of rail service in this country—in this century.

Mr. Kan is also experienced as a policy adviser to our current majority leader and chief economist for the Senate Republican Policy Committee. To put it bluntly, I think he possesses the necessary qualifications and experience for this position.

I have the privilege of serving as the senior Democrat on the Homeland Security Committee with the Presiding Officer, and this committee has the responsibility for vetting individuals who have been nominated to serve at the Office of Management and Budget.

During the confirmation process, I had the pleasure of speaking with Mr. Kan and getting to know him a little better and understanding better his goals for this important position. Mr. Kan clearly showed that he is intimately familiar with the issues that he would be tasked with managing at OMB, and he showed that he is willing to learn and work with others to ensure that he is doing everything he can to work productively on behalf of the American people.

In fact, Mr. Kan committed to work collaboratively with Congress to help us fulfill our oversight role. This is a shared responsibility: oversight. We all need to be interested in oversight. You don't have to serve on a committee that is focused on oversight—the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. You don't have to serve on a permanent Senate subcommittee as Senator ROB PORTMAN and I do—the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations—in order to be interested in oversight. You don't have to be elected to the U.S. Senate or to the House to be interested in oversight. This is something that we all should be interested in and all of us ought to be focused on, and we need to do it in a way that is collaborative so that we sort of marry our fortunes together and end up with the synergistic effect where the sum is greater than the parts thereof.

I was pleased with the words and the commitment he made to work collaboratively with all of us: Democrats and Republicans and our staffs. He also committed to working with the Government Accountability Office, GAO, to help them fulfill their critical oversight responsibilities.

I might add, GAO, which is our watchdog, does great work, as the Presiding Officer knows. They have been faced with an enormous undertaking, enormous challenges, with respect to the COVID-19 legislation we have passed and the need for resources to be able to do a good job in being the watchdog that we need.

I would just call on all of my colleagues to keep that in mind when we fashion the next COVID legislation and figure out how much money we need to provide for GAO to do the enormous job that is in front of them.

It is not often we get a nominee in this administration who is open to working with both sides here in the Congress and is understanding of the needs for the executive branch to be responsive to congressional oversight from this administration. In fact, Mr. Kan committed to responding to all oversight requests from the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, including requests from

Democratic Senators. He also committed to ensure that OMB responds to all requests from GAO.

I know these commitments ought to be standard operating procedure in our democracy, which is built on a system of checks and balances, but they certainly have not always been the case in this administration, especially for folks nominated to positions like the one he has been nominated for.

Mr. Kan's willingness to work with Congress and his clear qualifications to serve in this role are a welcome change in a Trump administration nominee that deserves to be recognized. For those reasons, I intend to support Derek Kan, who has been nominated for this important position at OMB. I urge my colleagues—Democrat, Republican, and an Independent or two—to do the same.

I have the privilege of serving as the senior Democrat on the Environment and Public Works Committee. In our oversight role there over the Environmental Protection Agency, we ask a lot of questions. We ask a lot of questions of that agency, the leaders of that agency.

We don't always get the responses that we need. In some cases we get the back of a hand—no response for days, weeks, months. In previous administrations, Democratic administrations where Republican Senators were maybe in the minority, they haven't always gotten the kind of response that they deserved either, but I think they have gotten better than we are getting in many cases right now when we try to get information out of EPA.

I think the sort of spirit that I sense and have observed in Derek Kan, we could use that spirit from some other folks who are serving in this administration and maybe keep him in mind when someday we have a Democratic President and a Democratic majority in the U.S. Senate.

So this is a vote I think we are going to take in a very short while, and I hope, when people come here to vote, they will keep in mind some of the words I have said and some of the words I quoted from other Democratic Senators and find a way to vote yes in this case.

We will hold him up to high standards. I think if he gets confirmed—and I think he will—that it is important that he continues to demonstrate the sort of values that I have found favorable in him today.

I just want to acknowledge that it is not every day a Democrat gets to hold the gavel at a committee hearing, and yesterday Senator GRASSLEY had some other business; he had to come over and vote on the floor and take care of some other business. There was no other Republican to take the gavel and conduct the hearing, and he called on a Senator from Delaware to assume the gavel—take the gavel and pound us all the way to the finish line in yesterday's hearing.

My wife said to me last night: What was the highlight of the day? And I

said that there were many highlights of the day yesterday, but that was probably No. 1.

With that, I yield the floor to my friend from Iowa, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I do thank the Senator from Delaware for bailing me out, as we sometimes say in Iowa.

I have two reasons for speaking this morning. No. 1, very shortly, this week is the 30th year of the Americans with Disabilities Act as the law of the land. There are plenty of reasons to recognize that law for the landmark that it is and how it has helped people advance in our society and get more equality, but also, I do it because a former colleague of mine from Iowa, Senator Tom Harkin, working along with Senator Bob Dole, worked really hard to get this landmark civil rights legislation signed into law. Since that day, America has continued to improve opportunities, inclusion, and access for individuals who live with disabilities.

As my colleagues and I work to defeat the virus, heal the racial divide, lower prescription drug prices, and restore the U.S. economy, let's take a lesson from the passage of the ADA, very much a cooperative relationship between Republicans and Democrats. Let's work together in good faith and work out our differences for the good of the American people—whether it was the Americans with Disabilities Act or, now, efforts to beat the virus and get the economy going.

WHISTLEBLOWERS

Mr. President, now I speak about an issue that each day, each year, every year for I don't know how many years I have spoken on this subject, but you will soon find out why this is an important day to me, as an advocate for whistleblowing and the protection of whistleblowers.

Earlier this month, the Senate unanimously declared today National Whistleblower Appreciation Day. Every year, we honor whistleblowers on July 30, and I want to tell you the history of that.

It was on July 30, 1778—I hope you heard that right: July 30, 1778—at the height of the American Revolutionary war that the Continental Congress passed the first whistleblower law.

It did so in support of American soldiers who had decided to blow the whistle on their supervisor. That supervisor was an American naval commander. It seems this commander had not been following the rules of war and had been brutally torturing British soldiers. Knowing his actions were against the Navy's code of ethics, the soldiers decided to blow the whistle to Congress. When they did blow that whistle, they got the full whistleblower treatment, the kind that I hear too often, even today. They were sued for libel and were thrown into jail.

Now, that doesn't happen to maybe a lot of whistleblowers in 2020, but whistleblowers are not treated correctly yet today.

Well, Congress wasn't hearing of how they were being treated by being sued for libel and being thrown into jail. In response to what had happened on July 30, 1778, the Continental Congress passed the first whistleblower law, stating its unequivocal support for the soldiers and affirming that it is the duty of every person in the country—not just government employees but every single person—to report wrongdoing to the proper authorities.

Congress even covered the legal fees of the jailed sailors.

Now, 242 years later, we find ourselves in the midst of another crisis, the COVID-19 pandemic, and today Congress and the American people depend on whistleblowers to tell us about wrongdoing just as much as our Founding Fathers did. In fact, we depend on them more because, as the government gets bigger, the potential for fraud and abuse, at the same time, gets bigger. So does the potential for cruel retaliation against our Nation's brave truth-tellers.

But here is the good news: For every rogue commander or manager, this country is filled with good, honest, hard-working people like those sailors—patriots—who are unafraid to step forward and blow the whistle just for a simple reason—to do the right thing, to get the government to do what the laws require, spend money according to how the law requires the money be spent.

I can think of no better way of remembering and honoring the whistleblowers than doing exactly as the Continental Congress did on that day in 1778: by renewing our resolve and our commitment here and now to pass laws that encourage, support, and protect whistleblowers; by telling whistleblowers through strong legislative action that they are patriots and that Congress and the American people have their backs.

I myself have several critical whistleblower bills pending before this session of Congress that are especially crucial in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. First and foremost, there is the legislation I have been working on to strengthen the False Claims Act. As we all know, the False Claims Act allows whistleblowers to file lawsuits and sue fraudsters on behalf of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government should be doing that, but the Federal Government may not know about it. Or if the Federal Government does know about it, they may have so many cases they can't deal with. So we allow the citizens, through qui tam-type lawsuits, to act in the place of the government. This is what my amendments in 1986 to the False Claims Act did.

Those cases, since 1996, have brought \$62 billion back into the Federal Treasury. The False Claims Act has never

been more important than it is right now this very year—34 years after I got it passed. That is because the massive increase on government funding to address the COVID-19 crisis has created new opportunities for fraudsters trying to cheat the government and steal hard-earned taxpayers' dollars. I heard some of this on Tuesday in my committee from people in Homeland Security who have been running down, either costing the taxpayers money or just receiving bad quality products to protect our healthcare people.

It is especially ironic, considering all of this, that the Department of Justice has been continuing its recent practice of dismissing charges in many of the false claims cases brought by whistleblowers without the Department of Justice even stating its reasons. This is definitely not the right approach.

If there are serious allegations of fraud against the government, the Attorney General should have to state the legitimate reasons for deciding not to pursue them in court. That is just common sense.

My legislation clarifies the ambiguities created by the courts and reins in this practice that undermines the purpose of my 1996 amendments to the False Claims Act, which was to empower whistleblowers. And remember, you shouldn't weaken a piece of legislation that has brought \$62 billion of fraudulently taken money back into the Federal Treasury. This legislation requires the Justice Department to state its reasons.

What is wrong with telling people why you are dropping the case and provide whistleblowers who bring the cases an opportunity to be heard whenever it decides to drop a false claims case?

These problems I am bringing up with the Department of Justice remind me of the initial carrying out of the false claims amendments that I got passed in 1986. The Department of Justice resented some citizen coming in and being able to go to court and get justice for the taxpayers because it made it look like the Department of Justice wasn't doing its job. So what? We are helping the taxpayers. We are enforcing the law.

I thought around 1992 or 1993 that they got over it and moved ahead with it. But even yet in 1992, Attorney General Barr, then—and I don't know whether he was Attorney General then or just a citizen—even claimed that the False Claims Act's amendments I got passed were unconstitutional.

By the time he got 30 years later, coming back into government—and my questioning him about it—he did say that he felt that the False Claims Act was constitutional. That is big progress from 1992, when you thought it was unconstitutional.

We still seem to have some problems with the Justice Department, but this bill should not be necessary, but I have to pursue it anyway at the present time.

Mr. President, on another matter, during the pandemic, there has also been a dramatic increase in whistleblower complaints filed with the SEC. Whistleblowers have been calling attention to scam artists peddling counterfeit and substandard medical goods and phony cures to the consumers.

The Whistleblower Programs Improvement Act, which I introduced last year, strengthens protections for SEC and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission whistleblowers. It requires the SEC and CFTC to make timely decisions regarding whistleblower rewards.

We are now waiting for the Senate Banking Committee to sign off on the SEC portions of the bill, which the SEC supports. I just had a conversation with the chairman of the SEC on this very point within the last hour.

I am also working on legislation that will provide timely, critical protection to whistleblowers working in our nation's law enforcement agencies. Of course, I have been having a national conversation—we all have been having a national conversation lately—about the role of law enforcement in our country. I firmly believe that law enforcement officers play a critical role in maintaining our system of justice. They are there to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens and never, of course, to do harm or infringe upon those constitutional rights.

For decades, it has been unlawful for law enforcement officers to work on any level to infringe on the constitutional rights of Americans. And whenever the Attorney General has cause to believe law enforcement is overstepping its bounds and infringing on those rights, he has the legal authority to intervene and pursue action on behalf of the United States to stop the practice and hold those responsible accountable. Of course, the Attorney General can't prosecute what he doesn't know about. It is law enforcement officers themselves who are out there on the frontlines protecting all of us.

Congress and the American people depend on them to be vigilant and to speak up if they see something happening that they know is wrong. Those who do choose to step forward and report violations in accordance with our Federal laws deserve Federal whistleblower protections. That is why I am working to ensure that law enforcement whistleblowers who report violations of the constitutional rights of American citizens to Congress and the Justice Department are guaranteed simple whistleblower protections, which we give to a lot of other people.

Another whistleblower bill currently awaiting passage is my Criminal Antitrust Anti-Retaliation Act. This legislation strengthens protections for private sector whistleblowers who report violations of antitrust laws. The bill was passed by the Senate last October and has been pending before the House of Representatives ever since.

The House tries to argue that the Senate is the legislative graveyard. We

hear that from people across the Roundtable on almost anything and any day. But here is a case where its delayed action on this bill suggests that it isn't always the Senate that isn't considering this legislation.

Each of these bills fills a critical void in our current whistleblower laws, and each one ought to receive consideration and an up-or-down vote before the end of this Congress. Of course, if that is going to happen, Congress needs to pick up its pace. It needs to take a cue from those strong actions taken by the Congress—the Continental Congress, let me emphasize, during the American Revolution, a body that saw the need, took the time, and devoted necessary resources to stand up for whistleblowers in the midst of a war for the very existence of our country.

Today, let's all take a moment to reflect on the high standards that those early Americans set for us back on July 30, 1778, and let's remember never to let excuses or partisan differences keep us from pursuing our common interests in passing strong, meaningful whistleblower laws.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Wisconsin.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, back in February 2020, before the COVID recession, there were 158.8 million Americans employed. We have gone through a lot. COVID is probably the most significant event—certainly in my lifetime—affecting people's lives, the tragedies we have seen, affecting our economy, affecting the Federal budget.

At the end of June, there were 142 million Americans employed. That is a reduction of 16.6 million Americans or 10.5 percent. I want people to remember that 10.5 percent.

Over the last month or so, there have been a number of respected economists who made forecasts of how much our economy is going to shrink. These are folks from the IMF and CBO and the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, economists at Morgan Stanley and Goldman Sachs. The range of what they are predicting our economy will shrink to is somewhere between 4.6 percent and 8 percent. This is causing economic devastation—a real human toll on real people.

As a result of that, Congress acted. We acted fast. We acted swiftly. We acted massively. We wanted to provide financial help to individuals who were unemployed all of a sudden through no fault of their own. We wanted to help provide financial need to businesses that were viable, that can hopefully survive and rehire and help us recover from this COVID recession. We also wanted to make sure we provided enough liquidity in the market so we wouldn't see any kind of seizing up and see real financial devastation.

The result of all that was that within a very short period of time, by the end of April, we had already passed four

different financial relief packages totaling \$2.9 trillion. We just held an oversight hearing in my committee 2 days ago. There is even dispute on that number. Some witnesses said it is close to \$3.6 trillion. I am going to use \$2.9 trillion as a minimum.

To relate that to what I just talked about, that represents about 13.5 percent of our economy. Again, employment is down 10.5 percent. Economists are predicting our economy will shrink somewhere between 4.6 percent and 8 percent. But we acted swiftly and massively. We knew what we were going to enact was far from perfect. We all understood that. It was far from perfect, but it worked, and we had to do it.

We passed an amount equal to 13.5 percent of last year's GDP. Less than a month later, Speaker PELOSI and her House Democrats passed a fifth package out of the House worth \$3 trillion—\$3 trillion. I am sorry. That is not a serious attempt at financial relief. If we add that to the \$2.9 trillion, that would represent 27.5 percent of last year's economy.

Again, employment is down 10.5 percent. Our economy will probably shrink by no more than 8 percent. Yet Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats wanted to increase the amount of debt burden on our children by passing a package that would bring the total relief package up to 27.5 percent of our GDP. It is not serious.

It should surprise no one when Leader MCCONNELL and Chief of Staff Meadows and Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, as they tried to forge a deal with Speaker of the House PELOSI and Minority Leader SCHUMER, that they couldn't reach a deal; that there was probably no goalpost that they will not move to make sure that doesn't happen.

But the problem with that approach—and I would call it a very cynical, political approach, really playing with people's lives and livelihood—is that tomorrow the Federal unemployment extension that we passed as part of the CARES Act—because we realized we wanted to try to help everybody who was unemployed because of the COVID recession—expires.

As I said, the CARES Act was far from perfect. I certainly did not want one of the provisions. I voted against it. I actually supported the amendment of the Senator from Florida to reduce the \$600 flat payment. That is a real problem because it represents something like 134 percent of average wages, and we are creating a very perverse incentive for people to remain unemployed when our economy is calling for more workers.

I want to quote an economic adviser to both Presidents Clinton and President Obama, Larry Summers. He once stated:

The second way government assistance programs contribute to long-term unemployment is by providing an incentive, and the means, not to work. Each unemployed person has a "reservation wage"—the minimum

wage he or she insists on getting before accepting a job. Unemployment insurance and other social assistance programs increase the reservation wage, causing an unemployed person to remain unemployed longer.

We want to avoid that situation. We want to help workers, but we want to avoid the situation where we prolong unemployment or create a sense for people to stay on unemployment insurance. The fact is that, according to a University of Chicago study, 68 percent of people collecting unemployment are making more on unemployment than they made when they were working. CBO estimates something between five out of six people currently collecting unemployment are making more not working than working. The Bureau of Labor statistics at the end of May said there were 5.4 million jobs open—not being filled.

We have a problem. We have two problems. We can't do a deal because I don't believe our friends on the other side of the aisle are serious about doing a deal. But we have unemployment expiring, and the current provision was too generous to create a perverse incentive.

I have introduced a piece of legislation that I have cosponsored with the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Florida, who would also like to speak to this. It is called the Coronavirus Relief Fair Unemployment Compensation Act. There is no fancy acronym. It describes what the bill does. It extends Federal plus-up for unemployment to the end of the year.

The COVID recession is not ending any time soon. Rather than having to come back and do this over and over again and increase the anxiety on Americans who are unemployed, let's extend this to the end of December. Our bill gives States the option of either a \$200 flat plus-up or a plus-up equal to no more than two-thirds of an individual's average wage, not to exceed \$500. The States have the option. If they can't handle the two-thirds plus-up, they can accept the \$200 flat plus-up.

In case our Democratic colleagues are going to complain about that as not being generous enough, two-thirds of weekly wages is exactly what the House passed in phase 2 of the COVID relief package. Two-thirds of average wages is what they set as the amount of money for paid sick and family leave.

I also want to point out that \$200 a week is eight times the amount the Democrats, back in 2008 and 2009—I think 2009—passed as part of the great recession relief package. They passed \$25 per week plus-up, so \$200 per week plus-up is eight times that.

Again, we, as Republicans, are trying to meet them already more than halfway to do a deal on unemployment. Again, those individuals who are without a job through no fault of their own have the comfort and relief that they will have assistance from the Federal Government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Just 5 months ago, we had the hottest economy in 37 years. Running a business—starting it from Main Street as a little company—it was lucky enough to grow over those 37 years. Three of my four kids run it now.

The reason I ran for the Senate was to make sure we had that kind of atmosphere in place for the productive economy, the enterprising, the hard-working Americans who work at companies on Main Street.

Since COVID arrived, of course, it shocked us all. We know it is a tricky foe. It has peculiarities. Yet the one thing that is certain is that we need to get back to the economy that was raising wages for those most in need, was doing it in a real way, and not through government.

Yes, government needs to get involved now and then, and this was the case. Like the Senator from Wisconsin stated, we moved quickly, and we did something.

What I see on the other side of the aisle, with this monstrosity of \$3.5 trillion, is an effort beyond just addressing the displacement from COVID-19. I see it as an effort to try to replace Main Street and the productive economy. It doesn't work through here, and we should have never, back in late March, had something that would have incentivized not working. Of course, we tried to fix it, but friends on the other side of the aisle did not agree with us. If we want to get back to some form of a new normal—sooner or later, when we whip this foe, COVID-19—and back to what it was before, we can't do it through government.

When you look at not only this bill they have but at the other stuff that we need to keep in mind in leading up to the election, we cannot afford it, and it doesn't make sense. It is replacing enterprisers, Main Street—everything that makes this country great—with a bloated Federal Government.

When I heard that this bill was out there—coming from a quick-footed entrepreneur now here in the Senate—I didn't hesitate at all to get on it. We need to do this because we need to cut to the chase. We have hard-working Americans who are still unemployed. They have gotten displaced out of that great economy. This takes care of that without putting into place something that is so broad, so expansive, and that does not address the essence of what is at issue here. It makes sure there is a pathway so that we can get back to that Trump economy—that economy which was working more for everyone than at any time ever before. Don't ask people who have been here in the business of government. Why don't you ask people who have been running businesses, who have been on Main Street, who have been doing it?

That is why we need to get this across the finish line. It addresses the

key thing that we need to do transitionally so that we may get back to where Main Street and the real economy are running things and where there is not an attempt by the other side to replace what has been making the economy work.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Indiana for acting quickly in cosponsoring this piece of legislation.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I thank the senior Senator from Wisconsin and the junior Senator from Indiana for their hard work in addressing the out-of-control spending of the Federal Government and for finding ways to assist Americans who need help in the midst of this pandemic.

The coronavirus is a crisis that has demanded action to protect Americans, but if we are not careful, Congress is going to create another devastating crisis down the road, one of our own doing. Our national debt and deficits—already at unsustainable levels—have skyrocketed as Congress has spent almost \$3 trillion to address this crisis. Even if you remove the Paycheck Protection Program that has kept workers on payrolls, the total amount spent by Congress to respond to the pandemic and help workers amounts to more than \$50,000 per unemployed American. Do you think any unemployed American has received anything close to \$50,000? Of course not. That is because every dollar spent by Congress seems to be spent in the least efficient way possible.

Now Congress is negotiating a new spending bill of at least \$1 trillion without even understanding if or how the \$3 trillion already allocated has been spent. You would never operate a business like that. You would never operate your household like that. Government should not be able to get away with it.

In June, I and Senators JOHNSON and CRUZ asked all 50 States how they have allocated the trillions of dollars in taxpayer funding they have received from the Federal Government for the coronavirus response. So far, the majority of States has refused our request. Instead of telling us how they are being responsible with American taxpayer dollars, they want more money from the Federal Government. Where is the oversight and accountability? It doesn't exist in Washington right now.

I am thankful that my friends Senators JOHNSON and BRAUN are focused on protecting our future and reining in Washington's excess. Instead of just throwing money at every problem, my colleagues are actually thinking about the impact this spending will have on the future of our children and grandchildren and how we are impacting our ability to fund our military and our

safety nets like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Over my 8 years as the Governor of Florida, we completely turned our economy around by making hard budgetary decisions, by cutting taxes and regulations, and by making sure we got a return on every taxpayer dollar. Senators JOHNSON and BRAUN and I all come from business backgrounds, and we understand that you just can't spend without having accountability. You have to invest wisely.

We have to start doing the exact same thing at the Federal level because, at some point, someone is going to have to pay for it. If we don't start acting in a more fiscally responsible manner, our children and our grandchildren are no longer going to have the same opportunities we all have had to live the American dream, and that is actually not fair.

It is time we take this seriously. The best way to help people right now is to get our economy reopened, to support businesses by cutting taxes and regulations, and to ensure that we have ample testing and PPE across the country. That is how we get back on track. That needs to be our focus in going forward.

I thank my colleagues for their hard work in trying to make sure we don't waste people's money and to make sure we take care of the people who actually need help right now.

I yield to Senator JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the Senator from Florida for his words of support.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill at the desk. I further ask 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in reserving the right to object, let's talk about how we got here.

For over 3 months, our Republican colleagues have dithered, dallied, and not taken seriously the most enormous health crisis we have had in 100 years and the most enormous economic crisis we have had in 75 years. Now, all of a sudden, in the last day or two, they see the cliff. There are many cliffs, but they see the cliff of unemployment insurance running out.

We have been asking them to negotiate on this for a very long time. We have had nothing. Speaker PELOSI and I asked Leader MCCONNELL to sit down with us almost a month ago, and he would not. So we got here because our Republican colleagues couldn't get their act together. They still don't have their act together, and now they are worried. Yet, instead of being serious about negotiating, they have created a stunt, which shows how unserious the Republicans are at coming to an agreement.

I dare say, if this bill were voted on by the floor, a large number of Republicans—perhaps a majority—would vote against it. It would fail in the Senate by a large margin and would never pass the House.

Instead of engaging in this stunt of trying to get the heat of America off their backs, they ought to do something real, which is to sit down and seriously negotiate with the Democrats about this issue.

This proposal, amazingly enough, is even stingier than the one the Republicans introduced a few days ago. Instead of giving workers who lost their jobs through no fault of their own a 30-percent pay cut, they give them a 33-percent pay cut. It is just so wrong, and if you look at all of the data, it has been rejected by the American people.

My colleague from Indiana says—and I know he is sincere—you can't solve this problem through the government. I have news for you. When you have the greatest economic crisis in 75 years and the greatest health crisis in 100 years, the private sector cannot solve this problem. That is one of the reasons you guys are all tied in a knot—you must have the government get involved, and you don't want to do that.

I hear my friend from Florida talk about the deficit. Well, that didn't matter when we passed a \$1.5 trillion tax break for the wealthiest people and the biggest corporations in America. The deficit didn't matter then, but when it is helping working people who have lost their jobs, when it is helping small businesses get on their feet, when it is helping to feed children, when it is helping to keep people in their homes and apartments, then we hear about the deficit.

Let me tell you what is wrong with this proposal. There are two basic reasons.

One, it doesn't work on its own. As I said, No. 1, it is even stingier than the original proposal. They are moving backward—our Republican friends are—and they are giving workers an even greater pay cut than they had before.

Second, the pandemic unemployment insurance has kept millions out of poverty. We all work to keep people out of poverty. This has worked. If we cut it back, it is estimated that millions will fall back into poverty and that millions will go in it.

The third is one of the few things we hear about to get the economy going. If you talk to our economists—liberal and conservative—they will tell you the No. 1 thing preventing the economy from getting worse is consumer spending. This bill puts money in people's pockets, and they spend it. Even conservative economists say it is very much needed to get the economy going.

Fourth, it can't work. We have called a whole bunch of State governments and State unemployment offices. They cannot implement this plan immediately, and many say it would take months. I know that the Senator from

Wisconsin has given States an option of cutting the thing to \$200 or getting 67 percent. Many States say they will never be able to implement the 67-percent part and that people will be stuck with that big cut.

The main point on that is that many States will not be able to implement this new plan for weeks or even months, and people will not have their money.

So the No. 1 thing that is wrong with this proposal is that, just on the merits itself, it fails by giving a big pay cut, by pushing more people into poverty, by taking money out of our economy that consumers can spend, and because it is fundamentally unworkable.

There is another reason. We have a lot of problems.

In a few minutes, I, the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from Michigan will ask unanimous consent to pass the Heroes Act.

We have a lot of cliffs. As of Thursday, hundreds of thousands—and soon millions—could be evicted from their apartments. This bill does nothing about that cliff.

As of this week—and next week's being a new month—State and local governments will be running out of money. Already, 1.5 million State and local workers have been laid off, and more will be laid off. That is a cliff. What are we doing about that?

Testing. If you go to any place in America, including the three States we are talking about here, people have to wait days and weeks for their test results, and some don't even ever get their test results back.

We are not going to solve this problem until we solve the coronavirus problem. We all know that President Trump and this administration have failed on testing. Almost every other Western country that has dealt with this issue—in Western Europe or East Asia—is way ahead of us. We should be ashamed. We have a President who has dithered and has not taken seriously the testing regime. The Heroes Act fixes that problem, and we are not going to fix our economy until we fix the healthcare problem, my friends.

The Heroes Act does many, many other things, like getting people back to school, not like Donald Trump does in pushing people back to school even if it is not safe. Well, remember what he did in Arizona? in Texas? in Florida? He pushed the State Governors to get people back. Now look at what has happened. The same thing will happen in the schools if we are not careful. We have help there, which my good friend from Wisconsin's bill doesn't even mention. That is another cliff.

We have a month before school starts, and this bill—skinny or stingy—is not up to the moment. It is not even close to being up to the moment.

It is amazing that we have such a crisis in America and that our Republican friends in the Senate and the White House and the House cannot even face up to the problem. They are obsessed

with saying we shouldn't spend any money. Well, believe me, if we don't spend any money, things will get worse, and we will have to spend more later.

This is the dilemma we are in because of COVID. It is no one's fault, but that is the dilemma we are in, and it is being made so much worse by this President. We don't hear a peep from the other side about how the President has messed this up. Instead, we get this stunt to try to show they want to do something that they know won't pass and know won't solve the problem.

So I am going to offer a unanimous consent request in a few minutes to pass the Heroes Act, which has already passed the House, so it would do some real good. It covers all the areas I mentioned and does a far better job at dealing with the unemployment situation than my good friend from Wisconsin's bill.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, a quick response. The Democratic leader states this is not adequate. Again, I would remind the Senate that in 2009, when they passed a Federal plus-up for unemployment benefits—total Democratic control—they passed \$25 a week. So the \$200 a week is eight times what they passed in 2009. Apparently, they felt that was adequate back then.

There was also a study out of the University of Chicago that a \$200 plus-up on State unemployment benefits coming from the Federal Government replaces more than 100 percent of wages for 20 percent of the workers currently unemployed. The other 80 percent get replacement that ranges up to 100 percent.

Again, this is a very generous proposal. And, of course, the option of two-thirds is exactly what the House passed in phase 2 of the coronavirus relief packages—two-thirds of weekly wages for paid sick and paid family leave. Now, all of a sudden, it is inadequate. And of course their solution—what they are going to offer—is another \$3 trillion, further mortgaging our children's future when we haven't spent about \$1.2 trillion of the \$2.9 trillion we have already authorized.

It is not a serious proposal, which is why Leader MCCONNELL could not negotiate, because they weren't negotiating in good faith. The Democrats are being cynical. This is not a serious offer.

This is a very serious and, quite honestly, more than generous offer to help Americans and alleviate the anxiety they are going to be feeling if the Democrats just simply decide to reject this. It is very unfortunate, but that is the state of play in the Senate. It is very sad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, before I do my UC, I would remind my good friend—I remind myself

to take off my mask—I would remind my good friend that it took us 10 years to get out of the crisis of 2008. Unemployment stayed high. Job numbers stayed high. Looking at 2008 as a model for recovery is not anything anyone would want to do.

In a few minutes, I am going to offer the Heroes Act as a unanimous consent alternative, and I mentioned before the many things it does. But let me just say in the larger sense, we have an enormous crisis in America. We have higher unemployment than we have ever had since the Depression. Today, the 150,000th death was recorded. Thus far, the Trump administration, followed by the Republican Senate, has been an abject failure at dealing with that crisis.

It would have been much better if the President had done what chiefs of state in Europe and Asia did—stepped up to the plate, implemented testing, and put adequate money in people's pockets. We might be more on the road to recovery, like those other countries are.

Aren't my Republican friends ashamed that Europe and Asia did better than us, the greatest country in the world? And do you know why? Because of the very philosophy my colleagues have mentioned—don't spend any money, and, in President Trump's view, ignore the crisis. It will go away when the weather gets warm. Everyone has testing, he said, back in March.

We Democrats feel the pain in America. We feel the pain of people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. We feel the pain of small business people who have struggled to build their businesses for decades—my dad was a small business man—and then they lose those businesses. We feel the pain of parents who can't feed their kids. We feel the pain of moms and dads who are worried about whether they can send their kids back to school safely. We feel the pain of people when they get tested and they have to wait days, weeks to get a result, when the test means nothing.

Our responsibility as Democrats and Republicans is to get something done, something real—not a stunt, not something stingy, and not something that is so narrow, it only deals with one aspect of the problem, inadequately at that. That is why we are offering the Heroes Act. It is not perfect. There are a few things some people might add. But it is a heck of a lot better to meet this crisis than what we have seen from our Republican friends—a bill that, as I said, moves backward, is stingy, and probably wouldn't get the support of a majority of Republicans if it were put on the floor, let alone any of us.

Of course we have to do something. The Heroes Act is the right thing to do. But I want to make one prediction for everyone who is worried about the future here. If the past is prologue, something very close to the Heroes Act will be enacted. Look at COVID 2, COVID 3, and COVID 3.5. In each case, the initial

Republican reaction was similar to the reaction we have heard this morning: Can't do it. We will dare the Democrats to block us.

It didn't work. The public was on our side. But more importantly, once the Republicans showed they couldn't bully anybody and couldn't put a proposal on the floor, an inadequate bill, and pass it, they came to the table and negotiated.

We are still waiting for Leader MCCONNELL to go into that room with Mnuchin and Meadows and PELOSI and me. We are waiting for our Republican Senate colleagues to come up with a coherent plan that can get their support. We are still waiting for the President to understand the gravity of this situation and do something about it, for God's sake.

I believe, if this is objected to, within a little while, our Republican friends will feel the pressure from their constituents and from national media to realize that they have to come and negotiate in good faith on a bold, strong, comprehensive bill that will pass.

Before I ask consent for the Heroes Act, I will yield first to my colleague from Oregon and then to my colleague from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, this morning showed why we need the Democratic approach to dealing with unemployment insurance and why the pain that was reported this morning would get even worse under the proposal offered by Senator JOHNSON.

This morning, Americans learned that our economy cratered in the second quarter—essentially, GDP dropped by 9.5 percent from April through June. That translates to a 33-percent annual contraction of the American economy. So what you have with today's analysis is a gross domestic product in free fall. If Republicans slash unemployment benefits with this proposal, the gross domestic product is going to fall faster, and the economy will collapse.

Folks, the economists, people who aren't political figures, told us this morning—this is a five-alarm fire. It is the biggest and fastest drop ever recorded, colleagues, wiping out years of economic gains in a matter of weeks.

The fact is, when you take the kind of economic hammering that we learned about this morning, and you have the Democratic approach with respect to supercharged unemployment—what we wrote in the Finance Committee, that Secretary Mnuchin signed off on, the \$600 per week, which finally included those people who nobody even talked about in the 1920s, gig workers and part-timers and independent contractors—they got a fair shake.

The reason we thought it was so important to supercharge those benefits and why we feel so strongly about doing it now, with an additional \$600 per week, is so that people can make rent and pay groceries, while all these folks are out of work. And we learned

again about thousands and thousands of more workers in every part of the country getting hit again with layoffs. When jobless Americans receive unemployment benefits, it becomes one of the biggest booster shots for the American economy. When jobless Americans receive unemployment benefits, and they spend it on food, they spend it on car payments, they spend it on rent, and they spend it on medical bills. It is part of the gross domestic product. It makes no sense—it makes no sense, colleagues—to take that support away, as the Senator from Wisconsin seeks to do.

One point four million people have filed for unemployment benefits this past week. Before the pandemic, unemployment claims had never crossed 700,000 in a single week, not even during the great recession. They have now been at 1.3 million or higher for 19 straight weeks.

So here the Senate is, a few hours after seeing the worst domestic product report ever recorded, and what is the response of the Senate Republicans? To slash unemployment even more than they originally proposed, yanking an economic lifeline from 30 million Americans and delivering an economic wrecking ball directly into our fragile economy.

The last point I want to make—and we have Senator STABENOW, my seatmate on the Finance Committee, here—is to highlight the fact that from the beginning, Senate Republicans were hostile to the idea of trying to give a fair shake to these workers and these families who were hit so hard.

Eugene Scalia—the first thing he said after we did that work in the Finance Committee—the first thing he said was not “Oh, we have to do our job administering the benefits.” The first thing he said was that his big concern is that unemployed people are going to be dependent on government. How preposterous.

I see my friend Senator BROWN here, who spends a big chunk of his waking hours talking about the dignity of work. So much for the dignity of work when you hear about what Eugene Scalia said.

I hosted a nationwide townhall meeting just a couple of nights ago, and there were workers from the Midwest, and they said: People are saying we don't want to work. If I get a job offer at night, I will be there the first thing in the morning, ready to go.

This is not about workers being unable to work; it is about scarcity of jobs, just the way those figures this morning pointed out.

So I think that we are going to have further discussion on other issues, but I just want to mention one last point before yielding.

Today we heard some remarkable comments about how Donald Trump—and I guess this was his musing, but whenever he muses, it actually sometimes is part of a strategy—he talked about putting off the election and that

the problem being that people would be voting by mail. Now, there is not a shred of evidence—not a shred of evidence—that this is a problem.

The reason it is not a problem—and I don't say it just because I am the Nation's first mail-in U.S. Senator; take the word of far-right conservatives—the late Dennis Richardson in our State, about as conservative as you get. One of the last things he did before he passed was he pointed out that there is no voter fraud in our vote-by-mail elections. He said it doesn't happen. A conservative. A rock-ribbed conservative.

So we just heard that comment this morning, Leader SCHUMER. Of course, the law says that he can't change the election, but it shows again why it is so important to have the elections provision from the Heroes Act—which I was honored to work with Speaker PELOSI on—be part of the way in which people vote this fall because they shouldn't have to choose between voting or their health. Most of the poll workers in America are over the age of 60, they shouldn't be put at risk, which is obviously what Donald Trump would be willing to do.

So the Heroes bill—we are now going to talk about, I believe, the nutrition part, which Senator STABENOW has championed so eloquently.

But I wanted to take a moment to focus on the economic numbers that came out this morning and how the Republican proposal would make our ability to fight what was described a few hours ago worse and also talk about the fiasco of Donald Trump's efforts every single day to chip away at people's opportunities to vote-by-mail and in other ways.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I am really proud to stand with a group of colleagues and leaders who understand what is happening to the American people and the hardship they are facing and the fact that they just want some help and they want people to understand that. We are in the middle of a pandemic. It is not done yet. We know we have to wrap our arms around what is happening with the healthcare pandemic before we can do anything else, but in the meantime we have an economic crisis, and we have a hunger crisis in this country.

It is very hard for me to listen to folks—all of us, none of us are worried about going hungry tonight, not one. My guess is, we are not worried about our grandkids or others whom we know going hungry tonight or our moms and dads, but there are 14 million kids right now who aren't getting what they need to eat and could very likely go hungry tonight. They need a safety net.

You know, when I look at what is the priority here with Senate Republicans, you know who gets a safety net? Wall Street gets a safety net. The stock

market gets a safety net. The Secretary of Treasury will say: Hey, what do you guys need? We are backing you up. We got your back. But for the families of our country who, through no fault of their own, have been put into a situation where they have to worry about a roof over their head and food on the table and dollars to be able to pay the bills through help with unemployment, our colleagues say we have the audacity to think that they ought to have a safety net, too; that the majority of Americans ought to know that somebody's got their back.

We are here to say that we are the ones who have their back, and we hope that before this is done, the Senate and the House will come together to do that.

Right now, there are senior citizens—a lot of them—who get a minimum amount of monthly help for their food. It is \$16 a month, not a week—a month. We have the audacity to stand here and want to pass a Heroes Act that would raise that to \$30 a month, and our colleagues will object to a \$14-a-month raise for our poorest senior citizens.

Now, for everyone else, I mean we are looking at about \$1.40 per meal—\$1.40 per meal. I would challenge any of us to try and get a meal for \$1.40. What the United States provides for someone who is in need of help right now is \$1.40 per meal, and we have the audacity to be asking for that to be raised by a little less than \$1 a day. That is what a 15-percent increase in SNAP is. It is a little less than \$1 a day for somebody.

Our colleagues act like this is unbelievable—unbelievable that we would think people should get 90 cents more a day to help with food. That is what we are talking about in this package. It is about getting people help. It is about understanding the hardships that they face and knowing it is not over and not going to be over for too long.

Let me just stress, in closing, that one of the most efficient ways we can address stimulating the economy right now is by putting money in the pockets of people who have to spend it. One of the best ways—in fact, economists tell us the best way is giving somebody \$1 that they have to go to the grocery store and spend it on food. If you give them \$1, it translates into \$1.70 in the economy to the grocery store, the processor, and the farmer. We need to get this done.

We are also deeply concerned about the proposals they put forward on education that I will leave for another day, but it is time—it is time to recognize what people are going through and let them know that somebody cares and somebody is going to help them and somebody is going to have their back.

I would yield to my friend and colleague from Ohio who has been such a leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I want to thank Senator STABENOW and Senator WYDEN.

I will speak for just 2 or 3 minutes. I know that Senator SCHUMER will make another unanimous consent request.

Think about what Senator MCCONNELL wants to do. Senator MCCONNELL is going to cut \$400 in unemployment insurance to tens of millions of unemployed workers, hundreds of thousands in my State alone—in Oregon, Michigan, Illinois, New York, Minnesota, Texas, Florida, and Wisconsin. Thousands of workers are going to lose \$400 a week.

Think about what is going to happen. Around the country, the moratorium on evictions is expiring. Around the country, in community after community, a moratorium on electric and water cutoffs is about to happen. So workers are going to lose \$400 a week. They are going to face eviction.

What is going to happen?

We know what is going to happen. What is going to happen is more people will lose their homes, more people will be in homeless shelters, more people will spend the night in their cousin's basement in the middle of a pandemic.

It is cruel, and it is really stupid policy to cut their income for unemployment for the millions of unemployed workers and then provide no dollars for rental assistance, no dollars for paying their mortgage, and no help for those workers. How can we? We are the United States of America. How can we do such a thing?

I yield to Senator SCHUMER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, just two quick things on what President Trump said today. I know my colleague from Oregon brought it up—the idea that, once again, all he wants to do is divert from his abject failure on the coronavirus crisis. He says: Oh, well, maybe we will not have an election.

That is up to the Senate and the House, Mr. President. President Trump, the election will be in November, on November 3, and you will not change it. Stop diverting attention, President Trump. That is what you have done for 3 months as more people get sick, as more people get unemployed, as we see the numbers we saw today.

Instead of focusing on all these crazy, egotistical, and wrong-headed ideas, focus on COVID-19, focus on testing, focus on unemployment, focus on getting the kids back to school, focus on the many problems we face and understand the moment and largeness of this crisis. I say that to President Trump, and I say that to my Republican colleagues.

We are waiting. We are waiting for you to get your act together and understand the depth of this crisis, the breadth of this crisis, and do something real—not a stunt.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 455, H.R.

6800, the Heroes Act; 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?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would like to first respond to the Senator from Oregon about the economic news: yes, on an annualized rate from the downturn in the second quarter, 9.5 percent. But again, I pointed out, respectfully, that economists are predicting a shrinkage of GDP 4.6 and 8 percent because we are in recovery.

The employment has dropped by 10.5 percent. We have already passed \$2.9 trillion. We haven't spent \$1.2 trillion of that at least. So we haven't spent \$1.2 trillion. Yet our Democratic colleagues want to pass a bill that costs \$3 trillion.

We are already \$26.5 trillion in debt by the end of this fiscal year. That would be approaching \$28 trillion. They want to pass a bill by unanimous consent for \$3 trillion when we haven't spent \$1.2 trillion of the \$2.9 trillion we have already passed. That massive amount would represent 27.5 percent of our economy, when economists are saying it will shrink by probably no more than 7 percent or 8 percent.

We don't need to authorize more money. What we need to do is help the American people who are unemployed. I know the minority leader called that stingy. The offer we are making—the \$200 flat payment—does not provide an incentive to stay unemployed. It replaces more than 100 percent of people's wages for 20 percent of the people currently unemployed—a 100-percent wage replacement for 20 percent. That is according to a study by the University of Chicago.

For the other 80 percent, it replaces up to 100 percent. What is stingy about that? Why do our Democratic colleagues want to propose continuing the \$600 per-week plus-up that is preventing people—incentivizing people not to reengage in the economy so that our economy can recover. It makes no sense.

Again, I will point out that the two-thirds option is the exact same amount that the House passed—the Democratic-controlled House passed in phase 2 of the COVID-19 relief packages for paid sick and family leave. So, again, we tried to tailor this to protect those American workers. We tried to tailor this based on what Democrats themselves have proposed and passed. Yet they would rather play politics. They would rather be cynical and object to my unanimous consent request because time is running out—I acknowledge that.

So we are responding, but as in so many other debates—whether it is gun control or immigration—it is their way or the highway. They simply will not

take yes for an answer. It is very unfortunate they are taking this position that they want to indent our children for another \$3 trillion, and they will not say yes to a very reasonable proposal structured on things they proposed and passed in the past.

Madam President, It is very unfortunate, but I have to object to \$3 trillion of additional debt on our children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader has been recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I believe there are pending requests by several Members, and I don't want to try to preempt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4019

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I thank the assistant Democratic leader.

We come back to the floor today, the Senator from Minnesota and I, to reoffer a unanimous consent request that Senator MARKEY, the Senator from Massachusetts, and I offered previously.

After the death of George Floyd and, unfortunately, similar incidents, it has become increasingly obvious that our country is in need of reconciliation—racial reconciliation and personal reconciliation.

One of the things we could do to honor the memory of George Floyd and to attempt to take one small step toward that reconciliation is to make Juneteenth a Federal holiday. We previously had offered this unanimous consent request, and my friend from Wisconsin has his reasons for objecting, but one of the major newspapers in my State said to me: Try again. So I am coming here to the floor to reoffer.

Juneteenth has been a holiday in Texas for 40 years because of the distinct Texas connection. Just to remind my colleagues, Juneteenth was the day when the Union Army Major General Gordon Ganger showed up in Galveston and told people who had previously been slaves that they were no longer slaves 2½ years after the Emancipation Proclamation.

I believe, in all sincerity, we need to remember our history because, you know what, we learn from our mistakes, and if we don't remember our history, we will not learn from our mistakes, and we will commit those mistakes over and over and over again.

The tragic and brutal killing of George Floyd earlier this year has shown a light on the injustices that still exist in our society. Now, for somebody who looks like me, my experiences have been much different from those of our friend TIM SCOTT, the Senator from South Carolina, or the experiences of a pastor whom I encountered

in Houston the other day at a roundtable that Sylvester Turner, the mayor of Houston, convened so that they could share with me their experiences.

This pastor, who was head of the local NAACP chapter, told me: I honor the police. I respect the police. I support the police. But my son, he is afraid of the police.

So, we clearly have a long way to go in treating all people the same, regardless of the color of their skin. And when the perception among some in the minority community is that they are being treated differently, that is a problem that we should all try to address together.

So one way we could attempt to make this small step toward that reconciliation and continue to remind ourselves on an annual basis of how far we have come but how far we still have to go would be to take up this bill, pass it, and get it to the President's desk without further delay.

At this point, before I ask for unanimous consent, I would yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Texas. I appreciate his leadership on this.

Juneteenth is among the oldest celebrations of emancipation and is certainly worthy of a Federal holiday. I want to read an op-ed from the Washington Post, written by the musician Usher, which I think eloquently sums up why it is not only important to honor this day as a Federal holiday, but it is also important to recognize it as a part of American history.

I ask unanimous consent to introduce the Washington Post op-ed in full into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[June 18, 2020]

USHER: WHY IT'S SO IMPORTANT THAT JUNETEENTH BECOME A NATIONAL HOLIDAY
(By Usher Raymond IV)

Usher Raymond IV is a musician, actor and entrepreneur.

At the 2015 Essence Music Festival in New Orleans, I wore a T-shirt that caught a lot of people's attention. The design was simple. The words "July Fourth" were crossed out and under them, one word was written: "Juneteenth." I wore the shirt because, for many years, I celebrated the Fourth of July without a true understanding that the date of independence for our people, black people, is actually June 19, 1865: the day that the news of the Emancipation Proclamation finally reached some of the last people in America still held in bondage.

I have no issue with celebrating America's independence on July 4. For me, wearing the shirt was an opportunity to inform others who may not necessarily know the history of black people in America, and who are not aware that Juneteenth is our authentic day of self-determination. It is ours to honor the legacy of our ancestors, ours to celebrate and ours to remember where we once were as a people. And it should be a national holiday, observed by all Americans.

Growing up in Chattanooga, Tenn., I was taught in school one version of U.S. history

that frequently excluded the history of my family and my community. The black history I learned came from the "Eyes On the Prize" documentary that aired during Black History Month. That was where I learned about Emmett Till, Rosa Parks and the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. When I moved to Atlanta at age 13, I went deeper and discovered more about the movement, the horrors of slavery and the resilience of our people. I came to understand Juneteenth's history a decade ago during a period of reflection and in pursuit of any ancestral history that would tell me who I am.

The liberation Juneteenth commemorates is cause for celebration, but it also reminds us how equality can be delayed. On June 19, 1865, on the shores of Galveston, Tex., Union Gen. Gordon Granger arrived by boat to announce to enslaved African Americans that the Civil War had ended and they were now free. While President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was issued two and a half years prior, and the Civil War had ended in April of that year, it wasn't until June 19, 1865, that almost all of our ancestors were free. We should honor their lives and celebrate that day of freedom forever.

I cherish the words of Nina Simone. I respect the legacy of Harry Belafonte and the unapologetic blackness of James Brown. I admire the entrepreneurship of Madam C.J. Walker. I have learned from my elders. Their wisdom has taught me to use my voice to support my people, so many of whom are hurting right now. Making sure that our history is told is critical to supporting and sustaining our growth as a people. The least we deserve is to have this essential moment included in the broader American story.

I am humbled by the platform that has been given to me because of my musical talents, but I know I must do more with it. As an artist, it is my duty to reflect the trying times in which we live. My heart is shattered by the ongoing injustices in this country, incited by its long history of racism that has led to deadly outcomes for too many of our people. This country must change.

And it must change quickly.

Recognizing Juneteenth as a national holiday would be a small gesture compared with the greater social needs of black people in America. But it can remind us of our journey toward freedom, and the work America still has to do.

We could observe it, as many black Americans already do, by celebrating both our first step toward freedom as black people in America and also the many contributions to this land: the construction of Black Wall Street; the invention of jazz, rock n' roll, hip-hop and R&B; and all the entrepreneurship and business brilliance, extraordinary cuisine, sports excellence, political power and global cultural influence black Americans have given the world.

And rather than observing Juneteenth as we do other holidays, by taking it off, we can make it a day when black culture, black entrepreneurship and black business get our support. A national Juneteenth observance can affirm that Black Lives Matter!

What changes do you hope will come out of protests and debates about police and race? Write to us.

I proudly join the incredible people and organizations who have been working on this for years, among them the inspiring Opal Lee, a 93-year-old from Fort Worth, Tex., who has campaigned for the recognition of Juneteenth at the state and local level. There has never been a more urgent time than now to get this done. On Thursday, Sens. Tina Smith (D-Minn.), Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.), Sen. Kamala D. Harris (D-Calif.) and Cory Booker (D-N.J.) announced that they are introducing legislation to

make Juneteenth a federal holiday. Congress must pass this bill immediately.

As we celebrate today, let's stay open to possibility. Let's support black-owned businesses today and every day. Let's uplift our resilient history. Let's honor our people. Happy Juneteenth, America.

Ms. SMITH. Usher wrote:

The liberation Juneteenth commemorates is cause for celebration, but it also reminds us of how equality can be delayed. On June 19, 1865, on the shores of Galveston, Tex., Union Gen. Gordon Granger arrived by boat to announce to enslaved African Americans that the Civil War had ended and they were now free. While President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was issued two and a half years prior, and the Civil War had ended in April of that year, it wasn't until June 19, 1865, that almost all of our ancestors were free. We should honor their lives and celebrate that day of freedom forever.

Usher continues:

Recognizing Juneteenth as a national holiday would be a small gesture compared to the greater social needs of black people in America. But it can remind us of our journey toward freedom, and the work America still has to do.

We could observe it, as many black Americans already do, by celebrating both our first step toward freedom as black people in America and also the many contributions to this land.

So thank you to my colleague from Texas. I am glad to stand with him in making Juneteenth a Federal holiday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. 4019; further, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me first state and make perfectly clear that I think the emancipation of slaves is a day worth celebrating. I have no argument whatsoever with the fact that we should probably celebrate it better than we have in the past. But there are other ways of celebrating it—a resolution in the Senate creating a national day of celebration without declaring it a national holiday.

The effect of declaring it a national holiday is primarily one thing: It gives Federal workers a paid day off. Now, Federal workers are compensated quite well, and I want to quickly go through this again, as we did last week. I have some charts up here.

If you take a look at just their wage, Federal workers, on average, make about a little over \$94,000 per year. In the private sector, the average wage is \$63,000, which is 67 percent of what Federal workers make. If you also include benefits—total compensation—Federal workers make, on average, about \$135,000, almost \$136,000 per year. In the private sector, it is about \$75,000, which

is 55 percent of what Federal workers make.

So if you strip out only the benefits, which is what we are talking about with holiday pay and paid family leave and other things, Federal workers, on average, get compensated about \$41,000 annually, versus the private sector's \$12,000, which is only 29 percent of what Federal workers make.

What we are talking about is a paid day off. Now, take a look at what Federal workers get in terms of the number of days off with pay. It is quite generous, particularly after last year's National Defense Authorization Act, in which we added paid parental leave.

I have two charts here. Here is one: If a Federal worker gets paid parental leave—and I realize that only happens a few times during somebody's lifetime—but Federal workers get 10 paid holidays. That is probably the max anybody gets in the private sector. In terms of paid leave, minimum, they get 13 days off; maximum, they get 26; and by the way, 26 is more than 5 weeks off with pay—basically paid vacation. They get 4 weeks after only 3 years. That is virtually unheard of in the private sector—very generous paid vacation in the Federal workforce. Then, with paid parental leave, they get 60 days off maximum.

So, a Federal worker taking advantage of paid parental leave will get 96 to 109 days off or, put a different way, for every 1.4 days a Federal worker works, they get a day off.

Now, let's strip out paid parental leave. Let's look at people who aren't having a child or adopting a child—again, same basic numbers: 10 paid holidays, 13 to 26 paid leave days, 13 sick days, for a total of anywhere from 36 to 49 days of leave that is paid. For a more senior worker, for every 4.3 days they work, they get a day off, which is basically a 4-day workweek. By the way, if they don't take the paid leave days, they can carry them over.

So, again, the private sector benefits aren't even close to this generous. I am not objecting to celebrating Juneteenth. What I am objecting to is the rest of America paying for another paid day off for Federal workers. By the way, it costs about \$600 million per year. The CBO score is over 10 years; that is \$6 billion. The sponsors of this bill want to just go ahead and incur that additional cost on the American economy and American taxpayers without a vote. They can't do it just by unanimous consent, which is really what I am objecting to in this process here.

So, again, I have a different proposal. We could either declare it a national day of celebration. That would be fine. Or we can go ahead and declare it and make it a national holiday, but if we are going to do that, let's just take one of their paid days away. They come out whole.

Last week, I was accused of taking something away from Federal workers. Not really—I am still leaving them

with the same 36 to 49 or 96 to 109 days off. I am just saying that it strikes me as kind of strange that the only way we can properly celebrate Juneteenth is by giving Federal workers a paid day off, paid by every other American taxpayer, to the tune of \$600 million a year.

So, again, what I would recommend is that modification: Declare Juneteenth a national paid holiday but remove one of their paid sick leaves. So I ask the Senator to modify his request to include my amendment at the desk; that the amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered and read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his proposal?

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is notable to me that we are gathered here today, while in Atlanta we are celebrating the life of JOHN LEWIS. In this moment, I think it is worth remembering that when Congress was debating whether to make a Federal holiday honoring Martin Luther King, Jr.—Dr. King, in the 1980s—people made this same kind of argument about its potential cost. Ronald Reagan made this argument. But President Reagan came around, and he signed into law this bill, and now that holiday is celebrated nationwide as a day of reflection and rededication to progress toward racial justice. Just as the civil rights movement is honored as an important milestone in the history of this country, so should be emancipation.

Just as the argument that it is too expensive to give Federal employees a day off was wrong regarding Martin Luther King Day, it is wrong for Juneteenth. And just as Ronald Reagan got on the right side of history, I think that we will get on the right side of history, and we will finally have a full holiday to commemorate Juneteenth, not as a holiday with an asterisk, not as a half holiday, but as a full holiday; therefore, I object to this modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

HEALS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if you want to know what is wrong with Washington, take a snapshot of this day. Take a snapshot of where we stand at this moment.

In the midst of the worst health crisis in American history in 100 years and in the midst of the worst economic setback in 75 years, we have reached the point in the U.S. Senate where we are going to adjourn until next week,

leaving in doubt whether 30 million unemployed Americans will continue to receive support from the Federal Government. How have we reached this point?

Well, in anticipation of this moment, 10 weeks ago, the House of Representatives passed a rescue package that not only addressed unemployment benefits but a score of other major concerns we have at this moment in our history and at this moment in our economy—10 weeks ago.

Since then, the burden has been on the Republican leader in the U.S. Senate, Senator MCCONNELL, of Kentucky, to pick up the challenge and to produce his own approach, whatever it may be, representing his caucus—the Republican caucus—on what to do with the economy and what to do with the pandemic. We stand today, preparing to leave for 3 or 4 days, with nothing—nothing.

The situation is so bad that an individual Republican Senator decided to come to the floor and see if he could fix it. I disagree with his approach completely, but I respect the fact that he is as frustrated as we all are waiting on Senator MCCONNELL to come forward.

Here is the reality of what we face and the reality that Senator MCCONNELL should face. Any solution coming out of the Senate needs to be bipartisan. Democrats and Republicans need to agree, and we did on March 26. The vote was 96 to nothing for the CARES Act—96 to nothing. I went home to Illinois and people would come up to me and say: I can't believe you did that. I didn't think you agreed on anything in Washington, but you all agreed on one thing, the most significant economic rescue package in the history of the United States.

Well, we were challenged to do it again, and we have failed miserably in the Senate. Under the current leadership with a Republican majority, they cannot produce a bill to bring to conference or at least to a conference table between the House and the Senate.

I would like to address directly some of the arguments being made. Here is one that you have heard over and over. I think it is an urban legend, and I want to say a word about it. Here is how it goes: \$600 a week? At \$600 a week, at that level, individuals will not even take a job. They will sit home on the couch and watch another round of Netflix, bingeing, and they will not even want to go back to work. How many times have you heard that \$600 is just too much money? I can tell you that \$600 is the equivalent of \$15 an hour, which many of us believe is at least a minimum living wage. It is certainly not a luxury salary for anyone. If you have lost your job, that \$600 Federal check, together with whatever the State sends your way, has to pay for a lot of things: rent, mortgage, car payments, utilities—did I mention health insurance?—food, clothing for the kids, the debts you have already incurred

leading into this, and your credit cards. All of a sudden, \$600 a week tends to evaporate.

What if you had health insurance where you worked, and they laid you off or fired you and said it was over, that they are closing down? If you tried to pick up the employer's share of your health insurance, the average cost is \$1,700 a month. So \$600 a week, \$2,400 a month, and \$1,700 of it is just going to keep the health insurance you had on the job?

Then there is this abiding notion that people who are unemployed just aren't trying hard enough to get a job. They say: You know, the jobs are out there, and these folks are just saying: I would rather not.

Let's take a look at the facts, and here are the facts. For every job that is available in America today, there are four unemployed people. So it isn't as if it is the other way around, one job for every four unemployed people. It is four unemployed people for each job that is available.

And to the argument by some employers that, well, I just can't get them to come back to work, it turns out that employers are filling jobs faster now than at any time. There are people prepared to go back to work. I happen to believe that many of these people see returning to work as the right thing to do for them economically. Unemployment cannot last forever; they know that. Secondly, it may not be meeting their needs, as their family requires of them. Third, the job itself may be something they had invested part of their life into and want to continue. Fourth, there may be benefits in that workplace that aren't available, even through the unemployment system available today. So I reject the notion—this urban legend—that \$600 a week is so much that people are turning down the opportunity to go back to work. It is not an urban legend; it is an urban lie.

Yale University just came out with a report from their economics department this week. I put it into the RECORD yesterday. You can find it, if you wish. It proves the point I just made. They looked at the statistics. This is just not a viable complaint against the unemployment system.

What Senator MCCONNELL has led us to is this moment, where, when we return next week, there will be no Federal unemployment benefit—none. It will have expired. What do we say to these millions of family members who are struggling at this moment? Try harder. Go take anything. That is what the future is for you.

I don't believe that. I think we are a better nation than that.

Facing the worst public health crisis that we have seen in a century, realizing what it has done to each and every one of our lives and families, understanding how devastating it must be to lose a job in the midst of this, that sometimes people for the first time aren't working, realizing how desperate

these families are to keep things together, are we really going to walk away from them? I think it is time for Senator MCCONNELL to sit down with the Democratic leaders. There is no alternative to this.

Steve Mnuchin, the wandering messenger on Capitol Hill, can do his job—and I wish him well—but it is no replacement for grown-ups to sit at the same table, to sit down and work out a compromise. We did on March 26. We can do it again. We need to do it for these families.

I will tell you something else. When we get reports about the state of the economy—and I have heard numbers back and forth—that on an annualized basis it is contracting from 29 percent to 33 percent, that is a big amount. It is one out of three businesses. A third of the goods and services in this country—think about that—going away and disappearing. We have already seen evidence of that.

What do you do to put life back into an economy? Don't take my word for it. Listen to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Jerome Powell. He said it again yesterday: We have to deal with this pandemic; that means more testing.

The Republican proposal that is floating here and has not been offered, is \$26 billion more in testing. We are at \$100 billion. I think we need at least \$100 billion. Why do we need it? So it is generally available, easily available to every person and family in America; so that it is affordable—and I hope that means free—and, most importantly, so that it is timely.

To people who say, well, I took a test, I ask: How long did it take to get the results on your COVID-19 test? They say: Oh, 6 days, 7 days. That is not a timely test that you can use to make a plan. It is a piece of medical data. It is a piece of history. If we are going to hope to open this economy in a responsible way, to get to contact tracing that really works, if we hope to open our schools so they are safe for the kids and the teachers and the administrators and everyone else, we need testing available, and we need a system of testing that is timely.

We have failed in addressing this pandemic. Why do I say that? It sounds like an outrageous political statement. Because the United States has 5 percent of the population in the world and 25 percent of the COVID infections. Twenty-five percent of the COVID infections in the world are in this country and 5 percent of the population. Other countries have handled this better. We know it. We should learn from them.

This President has to get away from the medical quackery which he spreads around on his Twitter account and in his speeches. He has to stop looking at these medical gurus, which he discovers in the weird corners of the internet, and peddling their goods for the rest of America. He has to show some guts and wear a mask more often

so people understand that even Trump Republicans need to take into consideration what they are doing to the people around them. That, to me, is the only way to get out of this mess and do it quickly. Otherwise, we are going to face this more.

We should have done better. By this time, we should have had an alternative to what the House did 10 weeks ago. We do not. By next week, we have to do it.

I will just say flat out that there is no point in considering going home at the end of next week unless we have solved this problem. There is no excuse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator for South Dakota.

NEW MARKETS FOR STATE-INSPECTED MEAT AND POULTRY ACT

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I rise today to urge the Senate to include the New Markets for State-Inspected Meat and Poultry Act in a COVID-19 response legislation that we are considering during this work period.

This is legislation I have worked on with my colleague Senator ANGUS KING of Maine for several years, long before COVID-19 disrupted the safety and security of the American food supply. It has bipartisan support.

COVID-19 revealed the cracks in multiple industries—our food supply, pharmaceuticals, defense, and manufacturing in general. Every American pays the price for foreign reliance—every American. This is a moment in history when we can rebuild what “American made” and what “made America great” really means in the first place. That, of course, is American production and innovation across all industries.

As consumers of food—and that is everybody, Republican and Democrat alike, Independents included—we should demand that we have this production capacity in the United States. Heavy reliance on foreign production and manufacturing is a mistake, and America needs to see a renaissance of American production and ingenuity.

Just as an example, on July 29 of this year, it was announced that JBS, a Brazilian-owned company, intends to acquire the Mountain States Rosen lamb plant in Greeley, CO. It has been reported that JBS will grind hamburger and cut steaks, which, unfortunately, will eliminate the ability of this plant to process nearly 350,000 lambs within the United States. This is yet another example of a foreign company working to consolidate and to integrate the American food supply system to the detriment of U.S. ag producers. We just simply can't sit here and watch this occur on our watch. We are already paying the price of foreign ownership in our food supply system today.

The time is now to aggressively pursue American options for production and processing in order to protect American consumers and our entire economy.

Right now, we are actually giving an unfair and unnecessary advantage to the large, sometimes foreign-owned, meat processing facilities.

These large facilities typically pursue licensing through the USDA Federal meat inspection process, which gives them a certification allowing them to sell across all State lines. However, smaller processors that are trying to inject competition into a market which is dominated by primarily big players, typically pursue State-inspected certifications, which, unfortunately, today, do not allow them to sell meat across State lines. The irony is that the State processors that are out there also need to be federally approved to meet or exceed these Federal inspection standards. So our smaller meat processors are achieving a certification of equal or higher standards but are given a license with less ability to market their product. They have to stay within the boundaries of the State in which they are produced.

In my hometown of Fort Pierre, SD, a beef processing company was announced to be opening in May of this year, 2020. This is the kind of American production we want to see more of. But if this processor chooses to pursue a State-inspected meat license instead of a USDA license, they will not be able to sell across State lines, even though South Dakota's meat poultry inspection program has standards that meet or exceed Federal inspection standards. This is unacceptable and is harming our small American processors' ability to compete fairly.

This is why we should include the New Markets for State-Inspected Meat and Poultry Act in our next COVID-19 relief legislation.

In recent months, partially due to the toll the COVID-19 pandemic has had on our meat processing facilities, we have seen renewed support for this particular effort. In the Senate, we now have 12 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. Additionally, there was companion legislation which was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative LIZ CHENEY of Wyoming.

I would like to explain what our legislation does and why it is so important to include it as part of the Federal Government's response to COVID-19. The New Markets for State-Inspected Meat and Poultry Act would allow meat that has been inspected by a federally approved State meat and poultry inspection program to be sold across State lines.

Currently, cattle, sheep, and swine that are raised in South Dakota by some of the best producers in the world and inspected at a South Dakota processing facility are limited to markets within the State. Yet they meet or exceed Federal inspection standards. It just doesn't make sense, especially when there is high demand for locally sourced and processed proteins in a

State-approved facility, which, by Federal law has standards that meet or exceed Federal inspection standards.

Our legislation would allow these products, which pass State inspection standards, to be sold across State lines, opening up new markets for producers and giving consumers greater choice at the grocery store. At a time when our food supply is in danger, this is a very easy first step.

Like so many sectors of our economy, the food production industry was ill-prepared for the unprecedented changes that needed to be made when the COVID-19 pandemic hit. Labor shortages and worker protection measures slowed down plants around the country, and outbreaks even caused some of the facilities to shut down entirely.

We saw this happen in my home State of South Dakota, where our Sioux Falls Smithfield plant processes 20,000 hogs a day and employs approximately 35 hard-working individuals. At the peak of the crisis, hog processing dropped approximately 40 percent in May, and beef production dropped approximately 35 percent in May, when compared to 2019 production levels across the United States. At one point, there was a backlog of nearly 1 million cattle ready to be processed.

Meanwhile, grocery stores across the country began to see meat shortages on their shelves because of the chokepoint found in the concentration of beef processing at the big four packers, where processing capacity had been curtailed. Livestock producers were faced with one of the worst scenarios they could face—having to euthanize their animals because they weren't able to get them into a processing facility. While we have been able to recover some of the production capacity since that time, it is far from being back to normal, and we are still unprepared to deal with the continuing pandemic.

While we work to get meat and pork processing facilities back up and running at capacity, we should also be utilizing State-based solutions to help offset the backlog and help provide additional capacity. Specifically, we should include the New Markets for State-Inspected Meat and Poultry Act in the next relief package.

Currently, 27 States operate State meat inspection programs. Meat and poultry inspected at these facilities are already sold for public consumption in the States where they are licensed.

Today, if you have meat or poultry processed at a South Dakota inspection facility in Hudson, SD, you wouldn't be able to sell it across the border just a few miles away in Iowa, but you could sell it a couple hundred miles away in Lemmon, SD.

It really doesn't make much sense, especially since State meat and poultry inspection facilities are required by law to be at least equal to federally inspected processing facilities with regard to their food safety standards.

These products are safe for consumption and should be allowed to be sold nationwide. This will help offset the pressure on federally inspected facilities during the ongoing pandemic and in the future as well.

This is a commonsense solution that has bipartisan, bicameral support. It is time to end this arbitrary regulation restricting the sale of these products to within State lines and allow facilities inspected by State meat inspection programs to increase production and sell their product nationwide.

Including the New Markets for State-Inspected Meat and Poultry Act in future COVID-19 relief legislation is good for producers and very good for consumers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes when the afternoon votes are concluded.

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

VOTE ON KAN NOMINATION

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

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 152 Ex.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Cornyn	Graham
Barrasso	Cortez Masto	Grassley
Blackburn	Cotton	Hassan
Blunt	Cramer	Hawley
Boozman	Crapo	Hoeben
Braun	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Capito	Daines	Inhofe
Carper	Enzi	Johnson
Casey	Ernst	Jones
Cassidy	Feinstein	Kaine
Collins	Fischer	Kennedy
Coons	Gardner	King

Klobuchar	Portman	Shaheen
Lankford	Reed	Shelby
Leahy	Risch	Sinema
Lee	Roberts	Smith
Loeffler	Romney	Sullivan
Manchin	Rosen	Thune
McConnell	Rounds	Tillis
McSally	Rubio	Toomey
Murkowski	Sasse	Warner
Murphy	Schatz	Wicker
Paul	Scott (FL)	Young
Peters	Scott (SC)	

NAYS—21

Baldwin	Durbin	Sanders
Bennet	Gillibrand	Schumer
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Stabenow
Brown	Hirono	Udall
Cantwell	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cardin	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Booker	Markey	Tester
Burr	Moran	Whitehouse
Harris	Perdue	

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.

The majority leader.

HEALS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on Monday, the Republicans introduced a trillion-dollar proposal to give American families more coronavirus relief. Most urgently, the Republicans want to continue a Federal supplement to State unemployment insurance, which is set to expire, as we all know, tomorrow.

If our Democratic colleagues had acted with the urgency that struggling people deserve, we could right now be finishing up a major bipartisan package for kids, jobs, and healthcare. If our Democratic colleagues had acted with urgency, unemployed Americans wouldn't be facing a total elimination of this extra help.

Instead, jobless Americans are staring down this cliff because Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leader have refused to negotiate. They have refused to move 1 inch from the Speaker's far-left proposal that is so absurd and so unserious that their own moderate Democratic Members began trashing it the instant it came out. This is the multitrillion-dollar boondoggle that would tax and borrow in order to provide a massive tax cut to the rich people in blue States—the SALT giveaway; that would fund diversity studies of the legal pot industry; and that would do 1,000 other things with no relationship whatsoever to the crisis.

Just a few minutes ago, our colleague from Wisconsin tried to get consent to continue the unemployment assistance to prevent it from expiring tomorrow, and the Democratic leader objected unless he got to pass the entirety of the massive wish list. The Republicans want to continue this aid before it expires, but the Democratic leader says: Let them eat SALT.

This is what was written about their proposal: "Privately, several House Democrats concede [the bill] feels like

little more than an effort to appease the most liberal members of the caucus.”

Yet, now, Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leader have declared that unemployed Americans will not get another cent—not another cent—unless the Senate agrees to pass the entire bill that even the Democrats say is ridiculous. This is their position: Unemployed people, schools, hospitals, and American families will not see another dime unless they get to cut taxes for millionaires in Brooklyn and San Francisco. That is what this is about.

Sure, they will call the Republicans names for wanting to make sure the system doesn't pay people more not to work, but the Democratic leader gave away the game this morning. He said on the floor that he now opposes even continuing the aid at the \$600 level. They want jobless aid to expire tomorrow—period. Lest we forget, just a few days ago, multiple Democratic Senators and the Democratic House majority leader were all saying they were prepared to negotiate and land somewhere south of \$600. Multiple Democrats said they were open to continuing the aid at a level that didn't pay people more to stay home.

Now the Democratic leader hasn't just contradicted his colleagues and refused to talk, he has gone even further and declared he will not even let the aid continue at \$600. The Democratic leader has tried to rule out every option except that of leaving the Capitol today and beginning his weekend with this unemployment benefit set to expire.

These aren't the actions, my friends, that would lead to any agreement. They aren't the actions that will actually make a law.

I am not sure whether my Democratic colleagues really agree that hurting unemployed people is their side's best political strategy, but if that is their position, they will have to vote on it with the entire country to see.

In just a moment, I am going to make the Senate vote on a privileged motion that will be a motion to proceed to legislation which would be used to prevent the unemployment aid from expiring.

We have a number of views on both sides of the best way to accomplish that. The bill would be amendable. Nobody who actually wants to negotiate, nobody who actually wants a bipartisan outcome would be disadvantaged by merely proceeding to the debate.

We have had enough rope-a-dope. We have had enough empty talk. It is time to go on the record. We will see who really wants a bipartisan outcome for the country and who is trying their hardest to block one.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized to respond to the leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, we have had a lot of words from the leader—none of them talk about reality. One picture equals all his words: SCHUMER, PELOSI, Mnuchin, Meadows in a room negotiating, where the Republican leader can't even show up because his caucus is so divided. In his own words, 20 of his Members don't want to vote for anything.

Now, faced with a crisis they created—for 10 weeks we have asked the leader to negotiate, and now, finally, they have woken up to the fact that we are at a cliff. But it is too late—too late because even if we were to pass this measure, all the States—almost every State says people would not get their unemployment for weeks and months, all because of the disunity, dysfunction of this Republican caucus and of the leader, afraid to negotiate because he doesn't have his people behind him.

The bottom line is very simple: This new proposal moves things even backward. Instead of a 30-percent cut from what people are getting, it is a 33-percent cut. And we all know that the proposal that is in existence now has kept millions out of poverty.

Now we hear talk from the other side that this creates the deficit—this increases the deficit. We can't spend money. Well, I would remind them of the \$1.5 trillion tax cut for the rich—tax cut for the rich. No one even thought about the deficit then. But when it comes to average folks, working people, we don't hear a thing.

Unemployment is a crisis. There are many crises. All your constituents, the parents, are saying: Why can't we open our schools safely? They need dollars.

We can't negotiate that proposal. People are being thrown out of their homes. That is a cliff that happened Thursday. Nothing for that.

The bottom line is very simple: This is the worst health crisis in 100 years. This is the worst economic crisis in 75 years. Unfortunately, at this great moment of terrible trouble in our country, our Republican friends are paralyzed, and when they want to do something, it is a stunt, not a real negotiation, that they know won't pass, because their backs are against the wall and the American people—just look at the data—know who is to blame and know who doesn't want to help people.

So the bottom line is very simple: We Democrats know what the problem is, and we are unified. We have a very strong proposal. And to look at the things in that proposal with the callousness that my friend the Republican leader has done; to say that this is all politics when people are being thrown out of their homes and we want to give them shelter; when people are not able to feed their children and we want to give them food; when small businesses—men and women who have struggled—can't keep their businesses going, we hear nothing.

Our proposal—the one to which the Republicans objected—deals with these problems in a serious, significant, and, yes, expensive way. But we know what is going on on the other side of the aisle. It was said by my friend from Indiana: Let the private sector do it. Well, my friends, this is a moment where the private sector can't solve the problem. This is a moment when we do need strong, active, and bold relief—something that this caucus has been running away from, ignoring, for far too long.

My fellow Americans, we are in an enormous crisis. We are stepping up to the plate on this side of the aisle. Please let your Senators know on the Republican side of the aisle how deep this crisis is, how painful it is for people, and to step up to the plate, get in the room, and negotiate a real deal and stop doing stunts that simply are political—get it off my back—that you know cannot pass.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

UIGHUR INTERVENTION AND GLOBAL HUMANITARIAN UNIFIED RESPONSE ACT OF 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 178, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is 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 North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 153 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alexander	Boozman	Collins
Barrasso	Braun	Cornyn
Blackburn	Capito	Cotton
Blunt	Cassidy	Cramer

Crapo	Johnson	Rounds
Cruz	Kennedy	Rubio
Daines	Lankford	Sasse
Enzi	Lee	Scott (FL)
Ernst	Loeffler	Scott (SC)
Fischer	McConnell	Sullivan
Graham	McSally	Thune
Grassley	Murkowski	Tillis
Hawley	Portman	Toomey
Hoeben	Risch	Wicker
Hyde-Smith	Roberts	Young
Inhofe	Romney	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Jones	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gardner	Paul	Wyden

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Menendez	Sinema
Burr	Moran	Tester
Harris	Perdue	Whitehouse
Markey	Shelby	

The motion was agreed to.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 178) entitled “An Act to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.”, do pass, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2499

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, No. 2499.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the bill, with an amendment numbered 2499.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Coronavirus Relief Fair Unemployment Compensation Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 2104(e)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended by striking “July 31, 2020” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

(b) IMPROVEMENTS TO ACCURACY OF PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2104(b) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “of \$600” and inserting “equal to the amount specified in paragraph (3)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) AMOUNT OF FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount specified in this paragraph is the following amount with respect to an individual:

“(i) For weeks of unemployment beginning after the date on which an agreement is entered into under this section and ending on or before July 31, 2020, \$600.

“(ii) For weeks of unemployment beginning after the last week under clause (i) and ending before December 31, 2020, an amount equal to one of the following, as determined by the State for all individuals:

“(I) \$200.

“(II) An amount (not to exceed \$500) equal to—

“(aa) two-thirds of the individual’s average weekly wages; minus

“(bb) the individual’s base amount (determined prior to any reductions or offsets).

“(B) BASE AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘base amount’ means, with respect to an individual, an amount equal to—

“(i) for weeks of unemployment under the pandemic unemployment assistance program under section 2102, the amount determined under subsection (d)(1)(A)(i) or (d)(2) of such section 2102, as applicable; or

“(ii) for all other weeks of unemployment, the amount determined under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection.

“(C) AVERAGE WEEKLY WAGES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), for purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘average weekly wages’ means, with respect to an individual, the following:

“(I) If the State computes the individual weekly unemployment compensation benefit amount based on an individual’s average weekly wages in a base period, an amount equal to the individual’s average weekly wages used in such computation.

“(II) If the State computes the individual weekly unemployment compensation benefit amount based on high quarter wages or a formula using wages across some but not all quarters in a base period, an amount equal to $\frac{1}{3}$ of such high quarter wages or average wages of the applicable quarters used in the computation for the individual.

“(III) If the State uses computations other than the computations under subclause (I) or (II) for the individual weekly unemployment compensation benefit amount, or for computations of the weekly benefit amount under the pandemic unemployment assistance program under section 2102, as described in subsection (d)(1)(A)(i) or (d)(2) of such section 2102, for which subclause (I) or (II) do not apply, an amount equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the sum of all base period wages.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—If more than one of the methods of computation under subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of clause (i) are applicable to a State, then such term shall mean the amount determined under the applicable subclause of clause (i) that results in the highest amount of average weekly wages.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 2102(d) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended by inserting “with respect to the individual” after “section 2104” in each of paragraphs (1)(A)(ii) and (2).

(B) PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Section 2107 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(4)(A)(ii), by inserting “with respect to the individual” after “section 2104”; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting “with respect to the individual” after “section 2104”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)).

(d) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts provided by this section and the amendments made by this section are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(2) DESIGNATION IN SENATE.—In the Senate, this section and the amendments made by this section are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4112(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. President, I deployed to Washington to be a pragmatic problem-solver, and for the past 5½ years I have made it my mission in Congress to better the lives of hard-working Arizonans. In a time of toxic partisanship, this is no easy feat. It requires me to go across the aisle to find where the Venn diagram overlaps.

Well, today I am calling on my Senate colleagues to be pragmatic, to meet in the middle on what we should agree on. I am asking Senators to simply extend expanded unemployment benefits for 7 days while Congress comes up with a solution. Who could be against that?

With the 1st of August approaching, Americans out of work are counting on us for cash so they can pay their rent and put food on the table for their families. While some States will get the expanded checks, we understand, for the next week or two, Arizonans have gotten their last expanded check. These Arizonans are in my neighborhood, live on my street, and worked paycheck to paycheck before this once-in-a-century pandemic hit.

Well, I am here to tell them that Washington, DC’s dysfunction and bickering is alive and well. Congress, once again, is using hard-working Americans as pawns in their political games.

For the many Arizonans out of work right now, this is not a game. Americans, Arizonans are calling out for help, and it is time we deliver it.

What I am offering today is a simple 7-day extension of the extra \$600 a week for unemployed Americans while we work through our differences on how to move forward and see Americans through this first-in-a-century crisis. This is a reasonable proposal. Who could possibly be against this?

I understand, as we work to defeat this virus—which we will—and support the economic recovery for our country, we need to incentivize people to return to work safely, when they are able. And there are disagreements in this

Chamber on what that looks like, what the ultimate dollar figure or percentage will be, where we land and for how long.

I know today Congress needs to do their job and to prevent this desperately needed, extra lifeline from fully expiring. In this uncertain time, everyone is doing the best they can to make ends meet, to help each other, to help our neighbors, to stay safe—everyone, that is, except Congress.

Americans who have lost their livelihoods through no fault of their own due to this cruel virus should not be the collateral damage of political maneuvering. I am calling on the Senate: Let's do what we were sent here to do. Let's do our job.

In the face of the virus, we have asked millions of Americans to go back to work when they can safely, to make hard decisions, to do what they were hired to do. It is time for the Senate to do the same.

This is a reasonable request. It is simply a 7-day extension of the expanded unemployment benefits while we continue to work out our differences. Who could possibly be against this?

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill at the desk. I further ask 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this UC request is clearly a stunt. A 1-week fix can't be implemented in time, and the Senator knows that. Plus, there are many other problems Arizonans have in addition to this one.

Arizonan parents are worried that schools will not open safely. Arizona renters are worried they will be evicted from their apartments. Arizona parents are worried that they can't feed their kids. Arizona small businesses are worried that they will not have the necessary help.

All of those things are in the Heroes Act, plus not even a 1-week extension—which can't even be implemented—but an extension until January 31.

So I would ask my colleague to tell Arizonans whether she supports the Heroes Act or not, which goes much further and is much stronger on unemployment and many other issues.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. President, this is disappointing and a political stunt and a game. For all the normal people watching out there who don't understand why Washington is so dysfunctional, we are just looking for a 7-day

extension so they can get another check and pay their rent.

I asked the question: Who could possibly be against this?

Well, we found out. It is the Senator from New York. So you can clip the tape or put his picture on your refrigerator when you open it up because it is the minority leader who is against this, on his path to try and become the majority leader. And that is unfortunate. Arizonans deserve better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 6800

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am going to ask once again that our Republican colleagues support the Heroes Act.

This is a dramatic crisis affecting all of America in many different ways. We Democrats have come up with a bold, strong plan supported by the vast majority of people—average, middle-class people. Our proposal deals with the issue of unemployment all the way through January 31—not a 1-week stunt which can't even be adapted in time.

Our proposal deals with schools and their ability to open. Our proposal deals with small businesses. Our proposal deals with so many of the issues facing America.

Our colleagues on the other side, we know, are tied in a knot. Our colleagues on the other side can't come to an agreement on anything. They did an empty shell bill because the only thing they could support was an empty shell bill with nothing inside of it.

Well, that is not what the American people want. They want action. I would urge the Republican leader to start negotiating in good faith and in seriousness. I would urge the President to do things about testing and tracing, also in the Heroes bill.

I would urge that we rise to the occasion of this enormous crisis. We Democrats are doing that in a bold and strong way. We haven't heard anything from our Republican colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 455, H.R. 6800, the Heroes Act; 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?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we have already had this debate once today when the Democratic leader chose to offer this motion knowing that, of course, it is not serious. What he is talking about here, just after having rejected a very commonsense proposal, which is a 1-week extension for the unemployment insurance—by the way, at \$600, which is exactly what the Democrats say they want. They want to keep it at \$600 even though, as we know from numerous studies, that means that, for many people—in fact,

for 68 percent of the people on unemployment insurance, based on the University of Chicago study—they are making more on unemployment insurance than they can make at work.

I think all of us here in this Chamber want to be sure that folks are taken care of. In fact, we just voted on legislation to provide the ability to be able to debate this very issue and other issues. But to say that people should be making substantially more for not working rather than working is something I think even a lot of my Democratic colleagues do not find acceptable.

Instead, the minority leader, once again, is offering the Heroes Act, as he has done before. You will recall this is the House-passed legislation that was passed, actually, a while ago during different times. But it is \$3.5 trillion. That is what the CBO says—\$3.5 trillion.

That makes it, of course, the most expensive piece of legislation ever passed by either body anytime in our history, by far. By the way, it has a number of provisions that have nothing to do with COVID-19.

So here we are in the middle of this crisis. In many places it is getting worse, not better. We do need to act, but we need to be sure we are acting in an effective, targeted way and not putting things out there—a \$3.5 trillion bill including many things that have nothing to do with COVID-19.

It has immigration policy changes there. We can debate those separately. Immigration policy issues are very contentious and are tough things for us to resolve in any context, but certainly we shouldn't put it in a COVID-19 bill.

It has unprecedented mandates on the States that say to the States: You have to do the elections the way Congress wants to do them. You have to do mail-in ballots the way we are saying you have to do them. You have to use the kinds of ideas that we say you have to use.

This has always been in the province of the States. Again, a lot of my Democratic colleagues agree it should continue to be in the province of the States to make those kinds of detailed decisions on elections.

It doubles the amount of money in the Heroes Act that goes to States as compared to even what the National Governors Association is asking for. Three and a half trillion dollars begins to add up when you do things like that. You give twice as much to the States as the States are even asking for.

Of course, one of my favorites—and I know, again, the Senator from New York feels strongly about this from a tax policy point of view—included in the COVID-19 bill is a very expensive change in tax policy that actually is a huge tax break for wealthy individuals; that is, repealing the SALT changes that were made. Over 50 percent of the benefit of this goes to the top 1 percent. That is based on the Tax Policy Center.

Based on our own Joint Committee on Taxation, which is a nonpartisan group here in Congress, what they are trying to get through in their legislation, the Heroes Act—40 percent of that benefit or more, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, goes to those with income over \$1 million. What is that doing in the COVID-19 bill?

The Democratic leader talked about the need for more money for testing. I couldn't agree with him more. By the way, the proposal that was presented by Senator McCONNELL earlier this week has a lot more money for testing. It also has more money for antiviral medications, for vaccines, and for ensuring that workplaces can be safe. It has the same amount of money—maybe even a little bit more; the Senator from Tennessee can tell us—for our schools, to be able to reopen our schools safely.

There is a lot of common ground here. I think we can find it. I really do. I know that today has not been an example of that. We are even rejecting here—a moment ago—a 7-day simple extension of 600 bucks per week.

But when I look at it, I see the school money as being identical, and I see the tax provisions that we have to help encourage people to go back to work and encourage companies and nonprofits to put measures in place to make the workplace safe, like plexiglass shields or more hand sanitizers or PPE. These are all things we can agree on.

Even on the issue of unemployment insurance—and I have talked to many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about this—I think there is a way we can get there. I think Democrats realize that \$600 per week does create this disincentive because it is, on average, 134 percent of what people were making in the private sector. We can come up with a way to deal with that. One is a return-to-work bonus, which is an idea that has a lot of bipartisan appeal.

Let's put aside these games. Let's put aside these extreme positions. Let's figure out how we can come together. This evening was not a good example of that, having rejected the 7-day extension of \$600 per week of unemployment insurance, but I think now we have this opportunity, with the legislation that was passed earlier today, to begin to have that debate. We can have the debate on unemployment insurance. We can have it on a whole range of issues—how we deal with schools, how we deal with the healthcare crisis we have, the underlying crisis. We can deal with all these issues in a way that enables us to find common ground, to create real solutions for the people we represent as we face this unprecedented pandemic.

With that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, two quick points. One, my friend from Ohio—and I know he has lots of good

ideas and a great deal of sincerity—made my point. The vast majority of Republicans oppose \$600 for any time. That is why they are not calling it up for a vote—it shows what a stunt the Senator from Arizona has done.

Second, I think all the points my colleague made about things that are extraneous—they are not; they are related to COVID. But one thing not in our bill—\$1.7 billion so the President's hotel doesn't get competition. That is an extraneous thing. It is not in our bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask through the Chair, does the Senator from Ohio wish to speak further?

Mr. PORTMAN. No.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Arizona made a very commonsense proposal. We are in a position here in the Congress that we often find ourselves in: We have different opinions—dramatically different opinions in some cases. What she said was, while we are working those things out, let's extend the \$600 unemployment benefit for 7 days so people aren't hurt. That is a commonsense proposal. I regret that wasn't adopted.

I like what the Senator from Ohio said. Instead of starting—when you have a disagreement over several items, my experience is that you don't start with the things that you disagree on the most; you start with the things you agree on the most.

There are a number of things in the House-passed bill and in the Senate Republican bill that was introduced on Monday, which the President supports—let me repeat that. The House of Representatives passed a bill. They have a Democratic majority. The Senate has a Republican majority, and we have a Republican President. We have a Republican President and a Republican bill, and we have a House-passed bill, and it is time to see if we can put the two together. That is why we have two bodies. But that requires Senators and Members of the House who are willing to sit down and come to some compromise or some resolution of the issues.

There are some things about which we have big differences. One is the dollar figure. As the Senator from Ohio said, we have already spent \$3.5 trillion. That is a number so big, most of us couldn't even speak it before we got to this era of the sneaky, dangerous COVID virus.

Let's look at the other side. On what might we agree or many of us agree? We don't have 100 percent on either side who are going to agree on most anything.

We might start with schools. Schools are starting up in the southern part of the United States, where the Presiding Officer is from—Florida—and I am from Tennessee. Schools are getting ready to go back, and so are colleges.

That means there are 70 million students who would like to go back to school or college—100,000 public schools, 35,000 private schools, and 6,000 colleges.

What help do they need? They need help reopening safely so that they can go back with students physically present as consistent with safety as is possible.

I talked with the Governor of Tennessee, Bill Lee, yesterday. He said 93 of the 95 counties in Tennessee had schools that were going to reopen in person. Maybe not every student, maybe not every class, but in 93 of the 95 counties, the Governor said they know that children need to be in school and their parents need for them to be in school. Two-thirds of married parents work outside the home.

This is a bill for the children, though. I mean, every teacher, every pediatrician, and almost every parent knows that, especially with young children, if they are left out of school for such a lengthy period of time, it damages them; it hurts them. There is a health risk in going back, yes—not very much for young children—but there is a bigger emotional, intellectual, and physical risk if they stay out of school.

What have we proposed to do? We proposed to help pay for the schools to open safely and to help pay for the colleges to open safely, which most are doing.

The Chronicle of Higher Education said yesterday that 50 percent of our colleges plan to open this fall with students physically present. Thirty-five percent have a mix, with students physically present and online instruction. That means only 13 percent will be all virtual—at least that is their plan.

If we could agree on that, why shouldn't we help them? Well, we can agree on it because the House of Representatives bill and the Senate Republican bill have almost exactly the same amount of money in them—about \$1,250 for K-12 schools—that is a lot of money per student; \$1,250 per student—and about \$1,500 per student for colleges to help them open safely. We could agree on that.

I think we can agree on childcare. We ought to be talking about back to school, back to childcare, back to work. It is hard to go back to work if you don't have childcare. There are provisions in the House bill and the Republican bill that aren't so different.

Testing. We all believe, I think, that we need maximum advance on testing, especially point-of-care testing—quick, reliable tests. There is money in the Republican bill and in the Democratic bill to advance that effort.

Then there are the small business loans, called PPP. That probably was the most successful part of the early CARES bill, but a bipartisan group of Senators has worked on getting rid of some of the problems with it and come up with a proposal to extend that.

Those are several major points of which we agree. And I think the Senator from Arizona's suggestion that we pass the unemployment benefit for another week while we work together to get an agreement was a commonsense one.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 4375 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

SUPREME COURT

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I came to this floor 3 weeks ago to talk about the U.S. Supreme Court. I come today to revise and extend my remarks.

There are now five Republican-appointed Justices on the Court. Actually, Republicans have appointed 11 out of the last 15 Justices to the bench, but is this the conservative Court we have worked for? More to the point, is this a constitutionalist Court?

The only thing I can say for certain when looking at the results of this last term, that in the words of the late Justice Scalia: "The Imperial Judiciary lives."

This is a Court that freely rewrites congressional statutes, that has protected the worst leftwing Presidents of earlier years, that in the final week of its term, gave away half of the State of Oklahoma.

For those who consider themselves constitutional conservatives, these decisions are a clarion call to wake up and to acknowledge what is staring us in the face: Judicial imperialism is alive and well. It is marching on undaunted.

For religious conservatives, these decisions are a call to action. Now is the time for us to be heard, and we can begin with what we expect of our nominees to the High Court, what we expect them to understand, what we expect them to affirm.

That brings me to the case that propelled religious conservatives into activism and politics in a new way over four decades ago—the case that, for religious conservatives, made the Supreme Court the great issue of the day: *Roe v. Wade*. I know that when it comes to the Supreme Court, we are not supposed to talk about *Roe*. That is the open secret on the right. It is certainly what religious conservatives have been told for years: Don't mess up the Supreme Court nomination process by raising *Roe*. It is imprudent. It is in poor taste. It will divide our coalition.

No, we are supposed to stick to talking about process, about methods, maybe throw in some talk about umpires, but do not talk about *Roe*.

Well, the truth is, *Roe* is the reason we have a legal conservative movement to begin with. *Roe* is what propelled generations of religious conservatives to vote for Republican Presidents and Republican Senators and Republican politicians of every rank and station—

all on the promise to reverse this travesty of a decision, this moral and social injustice that in 47 years has taken the lives of 61 million unborn—61 million.

Republicans have said: Vote for us. Vote for us, and we will undo this wrong. We will return this issue to the people. Yet all these years later—11 Republican-appointed Justices later—here we are. The Nation is apparently no closer to the day when the Supreme Court will renounce this outrage, renounce its imperial pretensions, and allow the good and decent people of this Nation to debate and decide this matter for ourselves.

So I say to my Republican colleagues: How long must this go on? How many more elections must there be? How many more promises must be made? How many more Justices must be appointed before we will expect of our nominees what the voters already expect of us? How long before we ask our nominees to the Supreme Court of the United States to recognize *Roe* as the outrage that it is?

Let's just be frank. *Roe* is an illegitimate decision. It has no basis in the Constitution—none. It has no basis in the law. None of the Constitution's specific and enumerated guarantees of privacy even begin to legitimize the taking of innocent human life; none are remotely on point.

Even liberal scholars recognize this. Whole books are written about what *Roe v. Wade* should have said. *Roe* marks the point at which the modern Supreme Court decided that they would just impose their own views—their own social and moral and legal views—on the Nation, despite what the people want, despite what the Constitution says, no matter how the laws are written.

In the words of the late constitutional scholar, John Hart Ely—who was, I would point out, a political liberal—"Roe is not constitutional law and it gives almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

Roe is the very essence of judicial imperialism. It is a brazen power grab by unelected Justices imposing their moral and social views on the Nation, just like another group of Justices did in a case called *Plessy v. Ferguson*, just like another group of Justices did before that in a case called *Dred Scott*.

Yes, I do mean to compare *Roe* to those earlier cases because *Dred Scott* and *Plessy* and *Roe* belong together. They are the worst miscarriages of justice in our history—the worst judicial opinions of all time. *Dred Scott* and *Plessy* and *Roe* are abusive, morally repugnant decisions that wounded the soul of this Nation. They dishonored this Nation's fundamental face in the dignity and worth of every person.

For these reasons, *Roe* is no secondary issue, something to be pushed to the side in the nomination process. *Roe* is central. *Roe* is a window into the constitutional world view of a would-be Justice. It is a measure of their sense of what a Justice should be.

Because if you believe that *Roe* was rightly decided, then there just is no two ways about it, you are a judicial imperialist. If you believe *Roe* was rightly decided, you believe that unelected judges should have the power to enact their social views, to promote their own social agenda, regardless of what the Constitution says or what we the people have expressed preference for, voted for, and enacted into law.

I would just add that it seems to be the case, inevitably, that when Justices enact their views, they enact the views of a certain social class. Oh, yes. The highly educated, managerial front row of American society, the class of the faculty lounge and the C-suite, that is what you get when judges govern America. That is not what the Constitution calls for. That is not what the Constitution specifies. The Constitution says that sovereignty rests with "We the People"; that it should be the people who are in charge. It is what the American people want and have written in their fundamental law and in their statutes that should carry the day.

The people have a right to run their own government. They have a right to expect their views to prevail, to have their Constitution be obeyed, and to expect that the Justices appointed to their Supreme Court will abide by the Constitution's terms as we the people wrote them.

That is why I say today: I will vote only for those Supreme Court nominees who have explicitly acknowledged that *Roe v. Wade* was wrongly decided the day it was decided. I say again: I will vote for those nominees only and for those nominees alone. When I say "explicitly acknowledge," I mean on the record before they are nominated. I do not want private assurances; I do not seek them. I do not want forecasts about future votes or future behavior because, frankly, I wouldn't believe them. I don't want promises of any sort. I want evidence that Supreme Court nominees will obey the Constitution and the law. I want to see in the record clear acknowledgement that any nominee understands *Roe* to be the travesty that it is. If that record is not there, then I will not support the nomination. I don't care who does the nominating.

Some will say that this is yesterday's battle; that we should just accept *Roe* and move on; that today's Supreme Court is the best we could possibly hope for, to which I say that every single life is worth fighting for. I will not accept failure, and I will not accept defeat. I take this stand because I believe it is what justice and fidelity to the law requires in our time of me and of those who would exercise the awesome power of judicial review entrusted to Justices in article III of our Constitution.

I also believe it is what the Republican Party owes the millions of Americans who have made this cause the reason for their vote for many years—

these men and women of good will and faith who labor still day in and day out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation, working for that time when justice will be done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I would say that the views expressed by the good Senator from Missouri are not views widely shared by people in this country. And to compare the decisions in *Plessy v. Ferguson* and the *Dred Scott* decisions with the *Roe* decision dishonors the memory of Congressman John Lewis, who only today was buried, put to rest in Georgia.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, the COVID-19 pandemic has laid bare the systemic racial inequities, inequalities in our healthcare system.

While the virus has touched Americans of every race and nationality, it disproportionately impacts people of color. We all know that. People of color make up just 40 percent of our country's population but account for over 60 percent of all coronavirus cases and 50 percent of deaths from coronavirus.

These inequities manifest themselves differently in each of our States. In Hawaii, for example, we are seeing pronounced disparities among our Pacific Islander community and particularly among citizens of the Freely Associated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, and Palau. I am focusing my remarks on this vibrant community today because our country has rarely done right by them. Let me give you some background.

After liberating their territory in World War II, the United States administered the Trust Territory of the Pacific—which includes what are now the Freely Associated States—for nearly 40 years. Even in the most generous characterization, the United States failed to live up to its trust obligations to promote the political, social, and economic development of the region.

In addition to chronically underfunding social programs like healthcare and education, the United States used the Marshall Islands as a base for dozens of nuclear tests over a 12-year period, from 1946 to 1958, including the 15-megaton *Castle Bravo*—the largest thermonuclear device ever detonated by the United States. Decades later, the citizens of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands continued to suffer generational health consequences with substantially increased rates of cancer, birth defects, and miscarriages.

In 1986, the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands achieved independence and formally entered into Compacts of Free Association, COFA, with the United States. Palau followed in 1994. Under the terms of these compacts, these three countries provide the U.S. military with exclusive access to their strategically situated lands in ex-

change for security guarantees, economic and financial assistance, and the right of their citizens to travel, work, and live in the United States without having visas.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of the compacts to our strategic interests in the Indo-Pacific region. In a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing last year, U.S. INDO-PACOM Commander ADM Philip Davidson succinctly noted how the compact nations “contribute way out of proportion to their population in our defense.” This is particularly true with respect to China, wherein our compacts with these island nations enable us to literally hold the line against aggressive Chinese economic and military expansion throughout Oceania.

If we are to ensure a free and open Indo-Pacific, we must treat the compact nations with the respect they deserve. First and foremost, this means keeping the promises we have made to these partners, especially on healthcare. Our initial compact agreements stipulated that COFA citizens were eligible for a range of Federal programs as “permanently residing under color of law,” including Medicaid coverage. The so-called welfare reform law of 1996, however, resulted in COFA citizens’ suddenly becoming ineligible for Medicaid and other Federal programs even as they may live in the United States legally and indefinitely.

I have done some research as to what happened in the welfare reform law, and there is absolutely nothing in the legislative history of that law to indicate why, suddenly, COFA citizens were not eligible for Medicaid coverage. According to a report from the University of Hawaii Economic Research Organization, the exclusion of COFA citizens from Medicaid increased the mortality rate of COFA citizens by 20 percent and contributed to significant public health issues in my home State of Hawaii.

I have led the fight to pass bipartisan legislation to restore Medicaid eligibility for COFA citizens throughout my time in the Senate, and we have come close to righting this wrong on several occasions, including in the bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill that the Senate passed in 2013.

The COVID-19 pandemic injects a new urgency into this effort. All across the country, COFA citizens work in essential industries like meat processing, food service, and custodial services. These jobs put COFA citizens at an increased risk, and they are suffering disproportionately from COVID-19 as a result.

In Hawaii, Pacific Islanders make up about 4 percent of our population but account for nearly a quarter of our COVID-19 cases. In northwest Arkansas, the Marshallese make up no more than 3 percent of the population but have suffered half the deaths. In DuBuque, IA, the Marshallese community accounts for more than a third of the city’s COVID-19 deaths despite their

making up only about 1 percent of the city’s population.

A number of factors drives these disparities, but reduced access to healthcare certainly isn’t helping. In fact, it is hurting a lot. The Government Accountability Office estimates that 14 percent of COFA citizens in Hawaii lack health insurance—nearly three times the State’s average. Nationwide, 22 percent of COFA citizens are uninsured.

In the absence of restored Medicaid eligibility, which would certainly lower the number of uninsured COFA citizens, our community health centers are, once again, stepping up. My conversations earlier this month with representatives from Kokuia Kalihi Valley Comprehensive Family Services and West Hawaii Community Health Center reinforced the crucial role these community health centers play in building reciprocal trust with the communities they serve. Both community health centers have been working closely with COFA citizens to combat stigma and fear by reaching out directly to the community to encourage them to seek care. This includes providing testing and outreach services in multiple languages. They have also been coordinating food deliveries to families, including to COFA citizens who are quarantining at home, and assisting some families with alternate housing arrangements so they can isolate away from healthy family members.

Our health centers are doing exceptional work with COFA citizens, and I strongly support providing them robust funding in the next COVID-19 relief bill.

Most importantly, we need to uphold our commitment to the compact nations and restore Medicaid eligibility for COFA citizens who are legally in our country. We can do that by including my *Covering our FAS Allies Act* to restore Medicaid eligibility for COFA citizens in the next COVID relief bill. In the *Heroes Act*, the House has already restored eligibility to this population, and it is time for the Senate to join them in righting an historic wrong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 711.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark Wesley Menezes, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, 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 nomination of Mark Wesley Menezes, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

Mitch McConnell, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt, Mike Crapo, Martha McSally, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Joni Ernst, Cory Gardner, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, James E. Risch.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

The Senator from Nevada.

HEALS ACT

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, this Nation faces a moment of crisis. The coronavirus pandemic has taken a serious and devastating toll on our country. Right now, in every corner of America, families are struggling to get by, and they are worried about what the future holds in store for them. Americans are worried about where their next paychecks will come from. They are worried about whether or not they will be able to keep their small businesses open. They are worried about how they will be able to pay their mortgages, their rent, or their utility bills, and they are worried about how they are going to feed their children.

As I said before, this is a time of crisis, but it is a moment that we can overcome together. We are a nation that in the face of great challenges has responded with caring and compassionate leadership. COVID-19 is a major challenge—make no mistake about that—but we as a Congress can bring real and meaningful results to the American people. I am sad to say that the legislation introduced by Leader MCCONNELL, the HEALS Act, does not do this. In fact, it does not even come close.

This is a bill that slashes Federal unemployment assistance for people who are out of work not due to any fault of their own and because of a deadly pandemic and an unprecedented economic catastrophe. This is a bill that has no money for programs like SNAP to ensure that American children don't go hungry. This is a bill that provides no support to State and local governments so that they can continue to provide critical services during the pandemic. This is a bill that provides no support for the EIDL Program or EIDL Advance, which provide direct support to small businesses to pay their operating expenses. This is also a bill that doesn't even continue the eviction moratorium, putting countless Americans at risk of losing their homes as

soon as this weekend when the rent comes due. This is unacceptable.

In Nevada, our travel and tourism industry has been hit hard by the pandemic, which has hurt our entire economy. In April, unemployment reached over 30 percent—30 percent. It is the highest in our Nation. Even now, months later, unemployment is still in the double digits—15 percent by the last count—which is more than four times our pre-pandemic level.

Now, just as Nevadans feel that we can't take any more pain, this bill plans to slash unemployment relief?

Amidst our unemployment crisis, State and local governments are also struggling. In Nevada and across our country, our public employees have been on the frontlines of the pandemic, fighting against the disease and working to ensure the safety and well-being of all Americans.

With little revenue coming in and significant costs going out, our States, our cities, our towns, and our Tribes are now facing massive budget shortfalls that will require cuts to critical programs and which threaten the pay of our teachers, our firefighters, and our first responders. The HEALS Act—Senator MCCONNELL's proposal—has zero funds for any of them.

While the majority leader's party prides itself on helping business, our Nation's small businesses, too, are left behind in his legislation.

Small businesses, the economic engines that keep our communities going, have been hammered by this pandemic. But the HEALS Act has zero—zero additional funding for the Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program, which has benefited millions of small businesses nationwide, including tens of thousands of small businesses in Nevada.

Senator CORNYN and I introduced bipartisan legislation last week that would not only provide \$180 billion in funds to the EIDL and EIDL Advance Programs but will also lift the Small Business Administration's arbitrary caps on the loans and grants that all small businesses can receive.

Real bipartisan solutions are possible, but our bipartisan proposal to help small businesses is not in Senator MCCONNELL's bill either.

Let's be clear. The HEALS Act is not a bipartisan solution, and it does not address all the needs of the American people. Just as a house cannot stand without support from a sturdy foundation, we cannot expect the American people to stand upon a bill that is the legislative equivalent of cheap drywall and a coat of paint.

Our constituents, my constituents, need real support, a lifeline, not just window dressing. So I ask my colleagues in this body to rise to the challenge we face and provide that lifeline to the people of Nevada and to all of the American people.

Let's help people keep their homes. Let's help families feed their children. Let's help small businesses keep their

doors open. We must come together and develop timely, targeted, and thoughtful legislation to protect both the lives and livelihoods of the American people during this crisis. They deserve no less.

Across the country right now, scientists and healthcare professionals are working around the clock, maximizing resources, developing innovative ways to protect the health of our Nation and save lives. As they work day in and day out, Congress needs to do the same.

The House passed the Heroes Act over 2 months ago. It is long past time for the Senate to get to work. It is imperative that the Senate remain in session and that Senators remain in Washington, working tomorrow through the weekend until the Senate passes a true coronavirus relief bill. Working Americans don't get Fridays off, and neither should Congress.

Although we may not agree on every aspect of how to address this crisis, my Democratic colleagues and I stand ready to work across the aisle to deliver relief to the American people.

So I ask the majority leader, who controls our schedule—I ask him this: Don't we owe it to our constituents, to the American people, all Americans, to work through the weekend until we have an agreement? The essential workers on the frontlines of this battle aren't taking the weekend off to rest, and neither should we.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

ELECTIONS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, while I come to the floor this afternoon, I am kind of questioning whether the heat of Washington, DC, has gotten to people. Clearly, it has been a record July here, with 90-plus degree temperatures every day. But the notion that we should somehow cancel the election in the fall, I think, is either the heat of the moment or just clear wrongheadedness.

I have been waiting for some time to come to floor to talk about our voting system and why it is so important to protect it and why now we should recognize that Americans, in having to deal with the coronavirus, have had the ability to vote and the ability to get there and the ability to be protected while they are voting. It has occurred in several elections that we need to be doing more.

That is why I continue to support the efforts of our colleagues to make sure that we are doing everything we can to protect elections.

I know that Leader MCCONNELL has proposed the HEALS Act, but it doesn't contain any money for helping safe and secure elections in November. I know that the House bill, the Heroes Act, does help put money in place to keep polling workers safe during the pandemic. I know that we have other legislation, whether it is Senator WYDEN's bill, which I am on, the Vote By Mail

Act, which would help eligible U.S. voters vote by mail, or whether it is other legislation, like that of my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR, to help back up paper ballots and create election security grants to help States improve their cybersecurity.

I have talked many times at many hearings about our challenges with cybersecurity, and I know that all this legislation—my colleagues have been out here on the floor, and they have tried to bring them up, but to no avail.

Well, I think instead of suggesting that the election be canceled, the President should be advocating that Congress pass aid and assistance to States to make sure that, during the COVID pandemic, things are in place so that poll workers can get to their jobs on time, that they can work effectively in doing that and protect their health and security and protect the health and security of the public. What I don't think he should do is to diminish the very important role that mail-in ballot voting has had in the United States of America.

I say that coming from a State where we have mail-in ballots. The mail-in ballot system has grown over time to be the primary way in which we vote in the State of Washington. I say it is the primary way because I am sure there are ways that people can show up and vote at particular election offices, and there are probably other things. But, no, we don't have an election site. For those who love going to the polling places as a way to exercise their democracy and their rights, I appreciate that too. There is nothing better than participating in the democracy of an election by going there and casting a vote. But you also can increase the participation of the American public to vote by mail if you give them that opportunity.

So it just happened to occur that on my way in today, I was actually trying to cast my own ballot; that is, I have my mail-in ballot for the August 4 election that is going to happen next week, and I want to make sure I fulfill my constitutional duty to vote in the next election. So I think it is a great opportunity to come to the Senate floor and put stock really to the myth that I think the President is continuing to create that you cannot vote by mail.

Here is my mail-in ballot. Here is the ballot that is sent to my home address in Edmonds, WA. It basically has the date of the election on it and requires me to fill it out and return it. What is great about this ballot is this. First of all, I love mail-in voting.

Even if I liked going to the polling place, what you now get enclosed, in addition to your ballot, is a voters' guide, which is sent by the secretary of State. It is pretty thick because candidates also give a statement about why they are running. Literally, the citizens of Washington, weeks in advance before getting this ballot, can sit and leaf through the various positions of candidates, and they also include

websites. If you want to go to the candidate's website and look up more information about a candidate or see where they stand on an issue, it is a guide that helps you understand what your ballot is and who is on it.

Who doesn't think that is a great way to inform the American people about voting? We have one of the highest voting rates in the Nation. As I say that, I know that there are States that are not mail-in ballot States that also have high numbers in Presidential election years, but the great thing about our vote-by-mail system is we have a pretty good participation by our public in off-year elections. The school board election or local county election or even a regional election gets the attention that I believe is important for democracy and for voter participation.

I actually happened to start filling out my ballot this morning. I am not going to show everybody whom I voted for, but I will just show you what the front of the ballot looks like.

I did vote already in the Governor's race. No doubt I voted for a Democrat. I am a Democrat.

At the top of this ballot, once I am done, I get to tear off this device right here. It says: I voted. So there I go. I got a little boost to my democracy gene. I am so glad I participated.

Here is the actual number of this ballot and an ID, and I tear that off. I tear that off and keep it. I keep this, and this is proof that I mailed this ballot. That is the great part of our system.

Just for those who are really curious about this, I now have a privacy envelope. Now that I am done filling out my ballot, I stick it in this privacy envelope. Why do I do that? If somebody thinks that my privacy is violated because on the outside of this envelope I sign this signature, they separate these two things. This privacy envelope separates this and throws the ballots that are legitimate to be counted, and now no one knows exactly how I voted.

I take this privacy envelope, and I stick it in the official document envelope that I am going to mail back. So I stick it in there, and guess what I have to do? I have to sign and date it. That signature is the validation of this system. It is the validation by my signature, the same as when I went into a voting booth, as we used to do, and signed my name. It is a validation against someone who is trying to create mischief with this system. It is what makes the vote-by-mail system work effectively in our State. I say that because our State has had many close elections, and yet no one has ever contested the outcome of the final election because we go through this system.

Yes, we have had some very interesting incidents. We had a very close Governor's race once, where as they were recounting the ballots and counting through the official system, a gentleman owned up that he had voted for his wife who had died. He was so worried that he was going to get caught in

this system that he owned up in advance and said: I am sorry. I might be one of the seven final votes in this decision, and I want to tell people I made a mistake. I know that she was so enthusiastic, but she passed away, and it was just a few days ago. So I went ahead and voted for her.

So, no, that is not allowed under this system. This system works because we know who people are, and we have a validation of this system. This system allows us to participate and understand the election process.

So I don't know why the President will not let America vote, only if they vote in a way that he thinks is—well, I am not sure, because now he is saying we should delay the election. He is saying it should be delayed. I am saying what the President should be doing to help the constitutional rights of American citizens is protecting their right to vote by helping to secure our election sites with enough workers, people working at the polls if they choose to go and do that, and also protecting our mail-in ballot system by allowing those States that want to pursue a mail-in ballot to make sure that those ballots work and are delivered on time so that they can be counted.

I don't expect every State in the Union to adopt the same philosophy as the State of Washington, but clearly our State allows enough time for those ballots to get there. They allow so many days after the election. Why? Because we have a lot of military. We have 10 military bases, and we have a lot of people from Washington who are stationed overseas, and their ballots should not be made invalid just because they mailed them before the election but somehow, because of the travel time, they didn't get there in a timely fashion. So our State considers 7 days, the postmark after 7 days if it is delivered.

I know that for some people this is all new. They don't want to move to this. I guarantee you, in 25 years we will all be voting by mail. This system will be in place, and we will be asking ourselves: Why did we drag our feet?

I am at least heartened to hear that my Republican colleagues in the Senate have squashed the President's idea of canceling the election. Now what I want to hear is, Are they going to help us get the dollars and the systems in place to allow America to vote, to allow them to vote with confidence, not to constantly hear an undermining of that process but a support of that process, and not to undermine vote-by-mail, because it has worked in Washington? It has worked.

I was elected in the year 2000 and only won by 2,229 votes—not a lot—cast out of the huge number of voters in our State. Yet people had confidence in that system. It is not as if the numbers didn't change in a recount here or there or somebody found a mistake here or there. It was that we had a system where you can find a mistake.

So stop trying to cancel the election based on the success of what has empowered more Americans to vote and be involved and be educated in our democracy. Let America vote, and let's get on with putting the securities in place that will help America get to the polling places in a secure fashion and get their ballots to the election officials in a timely manner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, on February 21, 1940, John Lewis was born in Troy, AL—a son of sharecroppers, born to be a person to bring good trouble to the Nation. He grew up on his family's farm and attended segregated public schools in Pike County, AL.

As a young boy, he was inspired by the activism that surrounded him—the Montgomery bus boycott and the works of a leader name Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He attended Fisk University, and he organized sit-in demonstrations in segregated lunch counters in Nashville, TN.

In 1961, he started participating in the Freedom Rides. He was just a young man. He would get on board a segregated bus, and he would dare to sit in the “Whites Only” area just to make a simple statement—that any person of any race should be able to sit anywhere they choose to sit in America, and it would be OK. He literally risked his life just riding on a bus in the wrong seat.

He became best known in 1963 when he helped to organize the March on Washington. He was part of what they called the Big Six in the civil rights movement. He was nationally recognized. We lose track of the fact that in 1963 he was one of the keynote speakers in the March on Washington. He stood in front of the Lincoln Memorial at 23 years old.

His focus on nonviolent protests, his focus on training people on how to speak out for what is just and for what is right, his focus on challenging people to rethink justice and to be able to see all people as being created in the image of God, all people equal, was a message that our Nation needed to hear and was a message he delivered over and over again. From his youngest days, he brought good trouble, as he said, to our Nation to awaken us.

He led 600 peaceful, orderly protesters across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL, on March 7, 1965. They were going to march from Selma to Montgomery to demonstrate the need for voting rights changes in the State of Alabama, but Alabama State Troopers met them there in what is known as Bloody Sunday. He and other peaceful protesters, simply marching, were attacked and beaten for doing what is just.

It was a telling thing to see John Lewis's body this past week cross that historic bridge one last time, and as he crossed, to have Alabama State Troop-

ers stand on the bridge and salute his body as it went by because John Lewis brought change to America.

John Lewis was elected to Congress in 1986 in Georgia's Fifth Congressional District, where he served faithfully. He was affectionately known as being the conscience of the Congress.

He was trained in religious teachings. He had a theological degree. He was often called “the reverend.” He never lost track of his faith. He treated people with respect. Even people he disagreed with and voted differently from, he would treat them with respect in a way that would honor God and honor them and honor his own family.

What is interesting, some of the statements John Lewis has made over the years always struck me. His quiet demeanor and his stern way of addressing justice always came back to his faith. A statement he made in 2004 really sticks with me. He said:

I'm deeply concerned that many people today fail to realize that the movement was built on deep-seated religious convictions, and the movement grew out of a sense of faith—faith in God and faith in one's fellow human beings.

Many of us who were participants in this movement saw our involvement as an extension of our faith.

He said:

We saw ourselves doing the work of the Almighty. Segregation and racial discrimination were not in keeping with our faith, and so we had to do something.

And he did.

Representative Lewis left a long legacy as a civil rights leader. He will not be forgotten in our Nation. The Big Six leaders made significant changes. I think about those changes he saw just in his lifetime and the changes that he, personally, was engaged in making in our Nation. Representative Lewis once made the statement: “When people tell me nothing has changed, I tell them, come walk in my shoes and I will show you change” because Representative Lewis, just in his lifetime, in the battles he fought, led, and changed, changed segregated schools in America; took away segregated water fountains in America; took away segregated movie theaters in America; took away segregated public transport in America; changed how people applied for jobs, got jobs, enjoyed their jobs; changed the opportunities for a person being able to live wherever they wanted to live in America; changed even how we vote in giving equal access for every American to be able to get to the ballot and vote. That is just in John Lewis's lifetime. He left a legacy of change.

His nonviolent protests, his training in leading people, stands in stark contrast to what I see some people who call it protests are doing right now. When I see what is happening right now in Portland every night and watching individuals gear up and literally attacking Federal law enforcement, throwing Molotov cocktails at them, pointing laser pointers at their eyes, shooting large-scale fireworks at

them, trying to set a building on fire—when I watch that and those individuals trying to say they are protesting for justice—they are not protesting for what is just. John Lewis was protesting for what is just.

John Lewis made the change in America, led a Nation and led a generation, even as a young 23-year-old man, to do the right thing in the right way. The change that he brought is a gift to the generations for millennia in our Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

HEALS ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is Thursday afternoon, and normally I come down to the Senate floor to talk about the Alaskan of the Week—what I call that person. It is one of my favorite things to do in the Senate. But I just witnessed something so remarkable and disturbing that I actually want to come down to the Senate floor and explain what just happened on the floor because I think a lot of people probably missed it, if they are watching at home, and maybe didn't understand it. There was a lot of discussion going on here. Let me just say that the Senate minority leader from New York just objected to extending the current level of unemployment insurance in the CARES Act—\$600 a week to help American workers who had been laid off due to the pandemic. He just objected to that and stopped legislation that was moving on the floor to extend unemployment insurance for another week. Let me repeat that: The Senate minority leader of the U.S. Senate, when we are moving in good faith, as we are discussing and negotiating bills here, one element of CARES that is going to expire at the end of this month, unemployment insurance in the CARES Act, the Senate minority leader just blocked that from happening. Who knows why, but there will be millions of Americans, in 2 days, who will lose that benefit, and the Senate minority leader just blocked it.

I sure hope our friends in the media write this story because that is exactly, exactly, exactly what happened.

Let me describe in a little bit more detail. As you would expect in a democracy, in the U.S. Senate, we have been debating, working on, and negotiating a new relief package due to the pandemic. In March, we passed unanimously in this body the CARES Act to try to bring relief to our fellow Americans whom we knew were going to be hurting from this pandemic. We didn't have a crystal ball on how long relief could last or should last for unemployment, for businesses, for small businesses, for families, for hospitals, for schools, or for fishermen. So we are now working on, as you expect in a democracy, what we view as the appropriate next level because this has extended longer than any of us thought, and the impacts are very significant. That is what we are doing here.

The Republicans put forward the Health, Economic Assistance, Liability Protection, and Schools Act—HEALS. I think it is a good bill. It is not a perfect bill, but it has very significant—very significant resources for schools, for hospitals, and for families.

When I was home in Alaska and taking calls with my fellow Alaskans and heard what their priorities are and heard what they said was really important for them to have in any kind of the next relief package, part of my job is to listen and try to work hard to get that done.

There is a lot in the HEALS Act that is exactly what my constituents have been pressing for, what they need, and what I believe they need.

Let me give you a couple of examples: more flexibility for States and local governments on how to use the CARES Act funding that they already have, a very high priority; additional funds for our fishermen. The Presiding Officer knows how important that is, being from Florida. The original CARES Act had \$300 million. That was a provision I got into the CARES Act for fishermen. It is not enough but something important to this really critical part of the Alaskan, American, and Florida economies. The HEALS Act has \$500 million in it because they have been hit so hard. There is economic assistance in terms of another round of paycheck protection for small businesses whose revenues have been crushed, like in the tourism industry. Again, that is something my constituents have been asking about. Allowing 501(c)6s to access the PPP, that is in there. Allowing certain PPP borrowers, like fishermen and seasonal businesses to request an increase in loan amounts due to the changes that were in the interim final rules that came out of the Treasury Department, that is in there. Dramatic expansion of testing, more funding for vaccine development, everyone wants that. Securing supply chains for crucial medical equipment and critical minerals, many of which we have in Alaska, that is all in there. It is a pretty good bill. It is not perfect, but it is a pretty good bill.

The competing bill, you may have seen, you may have read in the paper a couple of months ago, came from the House—the so-called Heroes Act. It is a behemoth in terms of the pricetag, and it has some things that, actually, are similar to the HEALS Act: school funding, hospitals. It has other things that aren't in the HEALS Act, some things that I think would be completely unnecessary: a huge tax break for some of the richest Americans in the HEROES Act. Yes, that is in there. Economic impact payments for illegal immigrants—I don't think that is a priority right now, at least not for my constituents. An overt attack on Alaska Native organizations, dozens and dozens of them, Alaska Native corporations, stripping them of any Federal funds they receive in the CARES Act, that is in the House-passed Heroes Act. Trust

me, that will never pass on the Senate floor because I will not allow it. But that is in there. It is a highly inappropriate attack on 20 percent of the population in my State.

But here is the point: These are starting points. This is what happens in the Senate—or at least I thought these were starting points.

But I guess I was wrong because, when my good friend from Arizona came down and said we are having negotiations on these bills, we are having negotiations on how and to what degree to extend unemployment insurance from the Federal Government—she put forward a bill that we all agreed to that said, because we are negotiating right now and the one thing in the CARES Act that expires at the end of this month is unemployment insurance, let's extend it—at the current level.

It is right now. Let's extend it so the people who are relying on it can have something for the next week while we continue to negotiate and debate. That is very reasonable. That happens all the time here.

The Senate minority leader came down, and he blocked it. He blocked it. If you are not going to be receiving a check next week, there is one person you can blame. What did he say when he blocked it? Remarkably, he said, in essence, if the other side doesn't accept the entire Heroes Act—that bill that I just talked about that attacks Alaska Natives—then I am going to block everything. That is what happened on the Senate floor like an hour ago.

No, that is not working in good faith. I am sure that the minority leader believes that the national media will not blame him. He is probably right, but it should. But it should.

If you are one of the millions of Americans who are worried about this issue because you are out of work, we just put forward a very simple compromise: As we continue to negotiate, we will continue the unemployment levels paid to Americans that were in the CARES Act for another week, at the levels that currently exist.

It was blocked by the Senate minority leader, without a real explanation, essentially saying take our NANCY PELOSI \$3.5—actually, \$4 trillion bill or nothing. I sure hope the media reports on what just happened. I don't have faith that they will, but that is exactly what happened.

We are facing a national crisis. We don't always come together in immediate agreement on everything, but what we have seen in the last several months is that we have come together in the Congress. These bills haven't been perfect. The bills I just described—the HEALS or Heroes—aren't perfect, but what they require is compromise and working together.

When you can't get to a spot in a certain amount of time, you look at areas where, OK, this is going to expire right now—that is pretty important—so let's extend it for a week or two. That hap-

pens all the time here. People do it in good faith.

What we just saw was bad faith. What we just saw, in my view, was the Senate minority leader taking hostage this issue, hoping that his friends in the national media will somehow blame us. I think, if you are telling the truth and you just watched what happened on the Senate floor, that is going to be hard to do. My view is we have to come together in good faith to help our fellow Americans, my fellow Alaskans, many of whom are still really, really hurting. We have a Senator from Arizona who tried to do that just an hour ago on the floor, and it was rejected.

There are going to be a lot of people next week who are going to be hurting because of this, and I hope they accurately report why they are hurting, what just happened, and that is not the spirit of compromise that we are going to need to get through this pandemic.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 776 through 791 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Space Force; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Douglas S. Lowrey
Col. Curtis D. Taylor
Col. James P. Work

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Rebecca R. Vernon

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Randall E. Kitchens

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John B. Morrison, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade

indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Laura A. Potter

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Levon E. Cumpton
Col. Gregory C. Knight
Col. Kodjo S. Knox-Limbacher
Col. Edwards S. Little Jr.

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Martin M. Clay, Jr.
Col. David S. Gayle
Col. Eric J. Riley
Col. James P. Schreffler
Col. Michael J. Turley

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Farin D. Schwartz

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Gregory P. Chaney
Brig. Gen. Jill K. Faris
Brig. Gen. Jeffrey P. Marlette
Brig. Gen. Jose J. Reyes

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Paul T. Calvert

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jeffrey A. Kruse

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jeffrey A. Kruse

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. John C. Andonie
Brig. Gen. Charles K. Aris
Brig. Gen. Marti J. Bissell
Brig. Gen. Robert D. Burke
Brig. Gen. Edward J. Chrystal, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Damian T. Donahoe
Brig. Gen. Ralph F. Hedenberg
Brig. Gen. John E. Hoefert
Brig. Gen. Russell D. Johnson

Brig. Gen. Jeffrey A. Jones
Brig. Gen. John T. Kelly
Brig. Gen. Eric K. Little
Brig. Gen. Jerry H. Martin
Brig. Gen. Joane K. Mathews
Brig. Gen. Mark D. McCormack
Brig. Gen. Reginald G. A. Neal
Brig. Gen. Shawn M. O'Brien
Brig. Gen. David F. O'Donahue
Brig. Gen. Stephen B. Owens
Brig. Gen. Stephen M. Radulski
Brig. Gen. John M. Rhodes
Brig. Gen. Frank M. Rice
Brig. Gen. James W. Ring
Brig. Gen. Michelle M. Rose
Brig. Gen. John W. Rueger
Brig. Gen. Randall V. Simmons, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Carlton G. Smith
Brig. Gen. Steven E. Stivers
Brig. Gen. Timothy N. Thombleson
Brig. Gen. Jeffrey P. Van
Brig. Gen. Clint E. Walker
Brig. Gen. Michael D. Wickman
Brig. Gen. William L. Zana

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Trent R. Demoss

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Tony D. Bauernfeind

IN THE ARMY

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Andrew W. Batten
Col. John W. Bozicevic
Col. Lonnie J. Branum, Jr.
Col. Robert H. Bumgardner
Col. Tobin R. Clifton
Col. Timothy A. Coakley
Col. Brett P. Conaway
Col. Christopher R. Cronin
Col. Charlene C. Dalto
Col. Daniel A. Degelow
Col. Wayne W. Don
Col. Rodrigo R. Gonzalez, III
Col. David L. Hall
Col. Jeffrey S. Heasley
Col. Murray E. Holt, II
Col. Lisa J. Hou
Col. Todd H. Hubbard
Col. Michael J. Hunt
Col. David L. Kauffman
Col. Kevin R. Kick
Col. Sean A. Klahn
Col. Elmon R. Krupnik
Col. Nathan F. Lord
Col. John P. Maier
Col. Eric D. Maxon
Col. Laura A. McHugh
Col. Erin K. McMahon
Col. Paul L. Minor
Col. Peter V. Mondelli
Col. Thomas E. Moore, II
Col. Charles W. Morrison
Col. Michaele M. Munger
Col. Ronald M. Neely
Col. John C. Nipp
Col. Lance A. Okamura
Col. Justin W. Osberg
Col. James M. Pabis
Col. Robert F. Paoletti
Col. Patrick T. Pardy
Col. Kent M. Porter

Col. David K. Pritchett
Col. Daniel L. Pulvermacher
Col. Joseph D. Reale
Col. Ryan J. Robinson
Col. Bren D. Rogers
Col. Ricardo R. Roig
Col. Dana P. Sanders-Udo
Col. Shawn R. Satterfield
Col. William P. Scott, Jr.
Col. Isabel R. Smith
Col. Monie R. Ulis
Col. John M. Wallace
Col. Mark B. Young

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S
DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1779 AIR FORCE nomination of Leigh G. Johnson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2020.

PN1786 AIR FORCE nominations (21) beginning CHELSEA L. BARTOE, and ending DANIEL J. WATSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2020.

PN2041 AIR FORCE nomination of Kelly C. Martin, which received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2042 AIR FORCE nomination of Lance M. Gower, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2084 AIR FORCE nomination of Jennifer M. Kollmar, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 1, 2020.

PN2109 AIR FORCE nomination of Pamela L. Blueford, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2110 AIR FORCE nomination of Suzanne K. Romeo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

IN THE ARMY

PN1983 ARMY nomination of Nathaniel S. Sanders, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1984 ARMY nominations (40) beginning IVAN ARREGUIN, and ending CHEUN S. YOO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1985 ARMY nomination of James C. Birk, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1986 ARMY nomination of D013487, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1987 ARMY nomination of Jeremy J. Mandia, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1988 ARMY nominations (321) beginning YOUSEF H. ABUHAKMEH, and ending DAVID B. ZUSIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1989 ARMY nominations (69) beginning DANTE L. AMELOTTI, and ending LARRY L. ZHANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1990 ARMY nomination of Mark E. Patton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1991 ARMY nomination of Chris B. Winter, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1992 ARMY nomination of Gregorio Ayala, which was received by the Senate and

appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1993 ARMY nominations (3) beginning VICTOR E. BEITELMAN, and ending CHARLES F. GWYNN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1994 ARMY nomination of Brennan A. Bylsma, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1995 ARMY nomination of Derrick A. Dejon, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1996 ARMY nomination of Bradley C. Hannon, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1997 ARMY nomination of Christen L. Holcombe, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1998 ARMY nomination of Irwin Johnson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN1999 ARMY nomination of Brian J. Mawyer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2000 ARMY nomination of Shawn M. Pierce, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2043 ARMY nomination of Ericka M. Rostran, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2044 ARMY nomination of Nicholas D. Hebblethwaite, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2045 ARMY nomination of Steve L. Martinelli, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2061 ARMY nomination of Peter H. Chapman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 25, 2020.

PN2062 ARMY nomination of Heidi B. Demarest, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 25, 2020.

PN2085 ARMY nomination of Soraya Goddard, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 1, 2020.

PN2086 ARMY nomination of David A. A. Awanda, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 1, 2020.

PN2087 ARMY nomination of Andrew S. Lohrenz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 1, 2020.

PN2088 ARMY nominations (533) beginning STEVEN J. ACKERSON, and ending D015260, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 1, 2020.

PN2089 ARMY nominations (426) beginning JI E. AHN, and ending G010539, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 1, 2020.

PN2090 ARMY nominations (295) beginning MELINDA J. ACUNA, and ending D011138, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 1, 2020.

PN2091 ARMY nominations (38) beginning TALON G. ANDERSON, and ending D014845, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 1, 2020.

PN2111 ARMY nominations (7) beginning MARIECLAUDE C. BETTENCOURT, and

ending ROBERT S. VAIDYA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2112 ARMY nominations (22) beginning RUFFIN BROWN, III, and ending JOHN R. ZILLHARDT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2113 ARMY nominations (7) beginning TIMOTHY N. AAMLAND, and ending DONALD F. MCARTHUR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2114 ARMY nomination of Julie H. Formby, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2115 ARMY nominations (6) beginning EVAN HART, and ending EDWARD M. WISE, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2116 ARMY nominations (5) beginning JASON J. CARPENTER, and ending SHANE D. VANIA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2117 ARMY nominations (5) beginning JENNIFER M. DOUTHWAITE, and ending JEFFREY L. YONKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2118 ARMY nomination of Danielle M. Tack, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2119 ARMY nominations (2) beginning TERRY L. CLARK, JR., and ending BRYAN V. STEVENS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2120 ARMY nominations (7) beginning LAURA C. FAHRENBROOK, and ending ISMAEL RODRIGUEZ, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2121 ARMY nominations (21) beginning CHARLES C. BOGGS, and ending KARL G. WAGNER, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2122 ARMY nominations (7) beginning TIMOTHY J. BELUSCAK, II, and ending JASON J. POTTS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2123 ARMY nominations (2) beginning WILLIAM C. COMSTOCK, and ending KELLY L. JOHNSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2124 ARMY nominations (118) beginning ALEXANDER L. AILER, and ending KARLENE M. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2125 ARMY nominations (176) beginning LIDILIA M. ADORGARCIA, and ending JESSICA E. W. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2126 ARMY nominations (32) beginning ALEXANDRIA A.E. ARGUE, and ending AIDAN K. WOLFE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2127 ARMY nominations (55) beginning JASON C. S. ADAMS, and ending D015630, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2128 ARMY nominations (2) beginning GARY W. BROWN, and ending KATHLEEN E. GENEST, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

IN THE NAVY

PN2002 NAVY nomination of Justin W. Jennings, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2003 NAVY nominations (230) beginning MEHDI A. AKACEM, and ending JAMES G. ZOULIAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2004 NAVY nominations (18) beginning GREGORY K. ALBAUGH, and ending EDWARD A. WALTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2005 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MELANIE EVANGELISTA, and ending SCOTT T. OZAKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2006 NAVY nominations (7) beginning CHARLOTTE. CLUVERIUS, and ending CHRISTOPHER R. VINEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2007 NAVY nominations (8) beginning JOE K. BLAIR, II, and ending BRENDA K. SHEPHERD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2008 NAVY nomination of Gustavo Aguilar, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2009 NAVY nomination of Richard L. Eggers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2010 NAVY nomination of Richard H. Shreckengast, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2011 NAVY nomination of Michael V. Gomes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2012 NAVY nomination of David A. Schwind, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2013 NAVY nominations (10) beginning JOHN FRANCO, and ending MARK A. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2014 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JOHN A. EVANS, and ending CHRISTOPHER S. KOPRIVEC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2015 NAVY nominations (5) beginning PATRICK A. BELLAR, and ending PRATIK RAY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2016 NAVY nominations (4) beginning PERRY R. BARKER, and ending DAVID C. ROBINSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2018 NAVY nominations (3) beginning AMADA Y. AVALOS, and ending BILLY F. HALL, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

PN2046 NAVY nominations (16) beginning URIES S. ANDERSON, JR., and ending RILEY E. SWINNEY, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2047 NAVY nominations (9) beginning JOHN R. BELCHER, and ending SHAYNE J. SCHUMACHER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2048 NAVY nominations (21) beginning JERRY N. BELMONTE, and ending RICHARD P. ZABAWA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2049 NAVY nominations (45) beginning MICHAEL K. ALLEN, and ending JERRY W. WYRCK, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record June 24, 2020.

PN2050 NAVY nominations (30) beginning CHRISTIAN G. ACORD, and ending JEFFREY W. WHITSETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2051 NAVY nominations (40) beginning AARON N. AARON, and ending JASON M. WITTRUCK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2052 NAVY nominations (12) beginning BRIAN F. BRESHEARS, and ending ROBERT D.T. WENDT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2053 NAVY nominations (24) beginning DANIEL M. BRYAN, and ending MICHAEL A. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2054 NAVY nominations (8) beginning ARLO K. ABRAHAMSON, and ending TIFFANI B. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2055 NAVY nominations (14) beginning JAMES C. BAILEY, and ending JASON R. STALEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2056 NAVY nominations (16) beginning DANIEL J. BELLINGHAUSEN, and ending ERIC R. ZILBERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2057 NAVY nominations (36) beginning REBECCA K. ADAMS and ending MARCELA C. ZELAYA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2058 NAVY nominations (27) beginning GINA M. D. BECKER, and ending ANNE L. ZACK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2059 NAVY nominations (473) beginning JOSEPH F. ABRUTZ, III, and ending KEITH S. ZEUNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2060 NAVY nominations (15) beginning SHELLEY E. BRANCH, and ending TROY L. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2020.

PN2129 NAVY nomination of Ruth E. Cook, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

PN2130 NAVY nomination of Brent J. Tilseth, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 21, 2020.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

PN2019 SPACE FORCE nomination if Michael S. Hopkins, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 2020.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be

in 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 JACOB WALTH

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Jacob Walth, an intern in my Aberdeen, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Jacob is a graduate of Aberdeen Central High School in Aberdeen, SD. Currently, he is attending St. Cloud State University in St. Cloud, MN, where he is majoring in finance and real estate. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jacob for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

(At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I was absent when the Senate voted on vote No. 152 to confirm Executive Calendar No. 770, Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. On vote number 152, had I been present, I would have voted no on the motion to confirm Mr. Kan.

Mr. President, I was absent when the Senate voted on vote No. 153 on the motion to proceed to the House Message to accompany S 178. On vote No. 153, had I been present, I would have voted no. •

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD S. TAMBURINI

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I recognize Chief Richard S. Tamburini for his longstanding service and dedication to Rhode Island and our Nation. Chief Tamburini has serviced as chief of police for the town of Johnston for the past 25 years and will retire at the end of next month.

Chief Tamburini's public service began almost 60 years ago when he served with the U.S. Army's 72nd Signal Battalion. While with the Army, he advanced to the rank of specialist 4th class. After leaving the military, Chief Tamburini returned home to Providence's Federal Hill neighborhood and joined the Providence Police Department—again committing himself to serving and protecting others. He spent his first 29 years in law enforcement there, rising to deputy chief of police and earning degrees from then-Bryant College and then-Roger Williams College while with the department. After he ascended to the rank of lieutenant, Chief Tamburini gained distinction in

combating organized crime, gambling, and narcotics trafficking. His integrity and skill led him to become the first sworn police officer outside of the Rhode Island State Police to be granted authorization to conduct court-ordered wiretapping in Rhode Island.

In 1995, Chief Tamburini assumed his current role in Johnston, where he has become both the town and the State's longest serving chief of police. In his 25 years leading the Johnston Police Department, he has continued to serve as a role model for his fellow officers and has worked to strengthen the community's relationship with his department. His many accomplishments include instituting several popular programs, such as Walk with Cops to keep the department connected with Johnston's senior citizens, the Johnston Police Explorers program to help train the next generation of police officers, and the Johnston Citizens' Police Academy to give local residents a better understanding of the day-to-day operations of the police force.

Chief Tamburini, who is a member of the Rhode Island Criminal Justice Hall of Fame, has called his time in law enforcement his "life's work." Time and time again, he has been recognized for his innovative and outstanding police work, earning recognition from the Rhode Island Governor's Office, the Rhode Island General Assembly, and the throated U.S. Attorney General's Office—to name a few. I think we can all agree it has been work well done. I join my colleague, Senator WHITEHOUSE, in expressing my heartfelt gratitude for Chief Tamburini's years of exemplary dedication and service to Johnston, Providence, and our entire country. I wish Chief Tamburini, his wife Marie, his children and his grandchildren, the very best in the years to come.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I join my senior colleague to rise today in acknowledgement of the ending of an era in Rhode Island with the retirement of Johnston Police Chief Richard Tamburini next month. I want to thank Chief Tamburini for his five decades of service and community leadership. Prior to beginning a career in law enforcement, Chief Tamburini served honorably in the U.S. Army's 72nd Signal Battalion. The chief worked his way up the ranks of the Providence Police Department over nearly three decades, including a stint as part of a legendary organized crime investigative team along with then-detective and future fellow chief, Vincent Vespia. Tamburini would eventually become deputy chief of police in Providence prior to his retirement from the Department.

Chief Tamburini has led the Johnston Police Department for 25 years. His tenure as chief has been marked by an increase in community engagement through bicycle patrols, and through the Walk With Cops and Johnston Police Explorers programs. The chief's leadership and community-minded efforts have earned him a place in the

prestigious Rhode Island Criminal Justice Hall of Fame.

As Chief Tamburini told the Johnston Sunrise last year, trust between a police department and the community it serves is the key to effective law enforcement. He said at the time:

I really want to focus on that [trust], because as chief of police it's important to me that no matter what we do with the community, [we need] a strong relationship and a level of trust. I think that carries through to the rest of the department, so they can be assured of that.

Today, we pay tribute to a great Rhode Islander, my friend, Chief Richard Tamburini. I am grateful for his contributions to Rhode Island and wish him many years of well-deserved rest and relaxation with his family and friends. Godspeed.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT R. HOOD

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator REED, as the chair and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, it is our honor to pay tribute to a great leader and senior executive of the Department of Defense, Mr. Robert R. Hood.

Mr. Hood has served as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs from August 2017 to July 2020. As he prepares to leave this position to enter into the private sector, we commend him for his sound leadership, advice, and professional judgement on numerous critical issues of enduring importance to the Department of Defense, Congress, and this Nation.

Mr. Hood has served our Nation for more than 18 years in various capacities within the Federal Government. His service to our Nation includes roles as a professional staff member for the House Committee on Science, as well as senior legislative assistant, senior policy advisor, and assistant to the Speaker of the House of Representatives for policy. Mr. Hood also served 5 years as the Director of Congressional Affairs for the National Nuclear Security Administration, a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy.

Mr. Hood previously served in the White House as special assistant to President George W. Bush in the Office of Legislative Affairs, overseeing coordination with the Senate, including the Armed Services, Homeland Security, Foreign Relations and Intelligence Committees. Before working on the White House staff, Mr. Hood served at the Pentagon as the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, where he was responsible for promoting the policies, strategies, and budget of the Department of Defense to the U.S. Congress. Mr. Hood also served as the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, for Budget and Appropriations Affairs, working closely with the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

For the past 3 years as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, Mr. Hood deftly managed and guided the Department's congressional relations, ensuring the preparation of key senior leaders for Senate confirmations, congressional hearings, and briefings, while simultaneously developing and leading a skilled and focused legislative affairs team. His leadership, knowledge, and personal efforts greatly contributed to one of the most successful legislative years in Department history, culminating with the establishment of the U.S. Space Force, which was signed into law on December 20, 2019 as part of the fiscal year 2020 NDAA.

Mr. Hood provided significant contributions and leadership during the development and execution of the Secretary of Defense's Congressional Engagement Strategy, ensuring an integrated legislative program directly aligned with the National Defense Strategy. This comprehensive plan supported the Department's priorities, aligned legislative objectives to the congressional calendar, and guided the execution of over 4,000 congressional engagements within the Office of the Secretary of Defense and oversight and alignment of over 10,000 congressional engagements across the Department during his 3-year tenure. The strategic execution of these engagements directly led to the attainment of Department of Defense legislative priorities and resourcing at historic levels in the fiscal years 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021 National Defense Authorization Acts, NDAAs, appropriations bills.

On behalf of the Senate, we thank Robert, his wife Jennifer, and his children: Evan, Caroline, Megan, and Emma, for their continued commitment, sacrifice and contribution to this great Nation. We join our colleagues in wishing him future success as he transitions into the private sector.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE CHARLES D. SUSANO, JR

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I honor one of my constituents, Judge Charles D. Susano Jr., who retired in April after 25 years of dedicated service to the State of Tennessee. Judge Susano is the state's longest serving state appellate judge and has led a remarkable life of public service and thoughtful jurisprudence.

Judge Susano is a native and lifelong Knoxvilleian. Born in 1936, he attended Knoxville Catholic High School before going to the University of Notre Dame where he graduated magna cum laude. Following an honorable discharge from the U.S. Army, Judge Susano returned to his Tennessee roots to attend the University of Tennessee Law School, where he was a member of the Tennessee Law Review and the Order of the Coif.

Judge Susano began his legal career clerking for Chief Justice Hamilton Burnett in the inaugural class of clerks to the Tennessee Supreme Court. He practiced law in Knoxville for 30 years, while also giving back to the community as a member of the advisory commission to the Tennessee Supreme Court on Civil Rules, as well as board member of several local nonprofits.

In 1994, Governor Ned Ray McWherter appointed Judge Susano to serve as a judge for the Tennessee Court of Appeals, and he won the seat later that same year. Judge Susano would go on to win statewide reelection in 1998, 2006, and 2014, and he served as the presiding judge of the Court of Appeals from 2012–2014. During his time on the court, he has authored over 1,000 legal opinions and received numerous awards including: the Justice Frank F. Drowota III Outstanding Judicial Service Award in 2017; Appellate Judge of the Year from the American Board of Trial Advocates, Tennessee Chapter in 2003; and the Courage in the Face of Adversity Award from the Knoxville Bar Association in 2004.

I want to thank Judge Susano for his many years of service to Tennessee. The end of his long tenure in the Tennessee judiciary will certainly be felt by many in the State. I wish him, his wife, and their children all the best as they begin this new chapter in their lives.●

TRIBUTE TO KEITH SALTHER

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Roundup Fire Chief Keith Salthe of Musselshell County for his bravery and decisive action that stopped the spread of a fire in downtown Roundup.

On the morning of May 20, 2020, Fire Chief Salthe and his team of 20 volunteer firefighters, as well as firefighters from Hawk Creek, Dean Creek, and the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, responded to a fire that broke out at the Vintage Café in Roundup.

Five hours after the fire ignited, Salthe and his team were forced to knock down the building to ensure that the fire didn't spread to the remaining businesses on the block.

For his decisive action, Musselshell County sheriff called Chief Salthe the real hero of the day and said that if it weren't for Chief Salthe and his team, the entire block would have been lost.

It is my distinct honor to recognize Fire Chief Salthe today. His leadership during this fire emergency stopped the spread of the fire towards other businesses, saving lives and preventing what could have been a tragedy for the community of Roundup. Roundup is fortunate to have brave men like Keith Salthe and his team of volunteer firefighters who were ready to jump into harm's way at a moment's notice for the safety of their fellow Montanans.●

TRIBUTE TO TERRY TOBINESS

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, it is my honor to recognize Terry Tobiness for her 50 years of dedication to her country, her patients, and her fellow veterans.

A graduate of the Helena College of Technology, Terry's first job out of college was at St. John's Hospital in Helena.

From then on, Terry went on to work at Crest Nursing Home in Butte, holding various roles over 18 years as a medical nurse, physical therapy aide, and assistant director of nursing and social services representative.

In 1980, Terry continued her service and joined the Army Reserves, deploying to the United Arab Emirates during the first gulf war as part of Operation Desert Storm in the 1990s.

As a fellow veteran herself and a dedicated health care hero, Terry spent the last 10 years of her nursing career in Great Falls, providing care at the Great Falls VA clinic in the Neurology and Pain Department as a nurse.

Terry's commitment to helping others is exemplary of the rich legacy of service we have in Montana. I know that all of Terry's patients over the years are thankful for her lifetime of service to the community, the State of Montana, and our country. •

TRIBUTE TO DAVE LILLEHAUG

• Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I rise to honor my dear friend, Minnesota Supreme Court Justice Dave Lillehaug, on a distinguished career and well-deserved retirement.

I have been lucky to call Dave a friend for 35 years and have seen him not just as a brilliant lawyer but a fearsome litigator, a tireless advocate in the pursuit of justice, and an excellent judge.

In fact, the same skills that led him to endlessly prepare for his date with his future wife Winifred somehow also landed him on the Minnesota Supreme Court.

Here is the story.

Winifred told me that she was more than a little bit unnerved during her first date with Dave—a lunch in Washington after they met when she was selling condos and he was buying one.

At lunch, Winifred realized just how much Dave already knew about her. She was from Pittsburgh, and he had read up on every detail about the town, including the latest steel plant closing. In those pre-Google days, 24 hours after meeting her, he had somehow researched every detail about her life so he could be informed and impressive on the first date.

She had already been thoroughly "vetted," as if she herself was being considered for a national office.

She was a little concerned, so on the next date, she brought a friend who happened to work for the Chamber of Commerce—just so she could get a second opinion.

Unfazed, wanting to impress her friend, Dave researched and memorized the entire legislative agenda for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Dave may have overdone it, and Winifred came away from the lunch convinced that he was interested in her friend and not her. Somehow, Dave salvaged it. Winifred and Dave have been happily married for 38 years.

Those same skills Dave honed when he dated Winifred served him very well on the bench.

I have so many fond memories of Dave, who impressed not just me but my family as well.

On the day Paul Wellstone announced he was recommending Dave for U.S. attorney, my mom sent the article to me on my honeymoon with the words "how exciting is this!" In addition to the usual newlywed photos, that article made it into my official honeymoon scrapbook.

Dave played a very important role in another seminal moment in my life as well. The night I was elected Hennepin County attorney, it was Dave counting the votes late into the night. It was close. Everyone went home—except Dave. And at 5:00 a.m. the next morning, Dave called to tell me I had officially won.

I am very grateful for Dave's friendship, his wisdom, and his sound advice and will be forever in awe of his brilliant career—as I know Paul Wellstone would have been.

Congratulations to Dave on his retirement. •

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL JON JENSEN

• Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the career of Minnesota Adjutant General Jon Jensen and to congratulate him on the next step in his career. On Friday, Major General Jensen will be promoted to lieutenant general and become our Nation's next Director of the Army National Guard. In this position he will oversee the national activities of the Army National Guard and work to ensure the Army Guard remains one of our finest public institutions.

General Jensen joined the Iowa National Guard's 168th Infantry Regiment in 1989 before later transferring to the Minnesota National Guard in 2002. Through hard work and dedication, he rose to become the Minnesota National Guard's 31st Adjutant General in November, 2017. In this role, General Jensen has served as the head of Minnesota's Army and Air National Guard, where he has demonstrated the highest levels of duty, honor, and service.

I have had the pleasure of working with General Jensen during my time in office at the State and Federal levels. He is a proven leader who has seen the Minnesota Guard through deployments, natural disasters, and preparing the Minnesota Guard to meet future challenges. We worked closely to preserve the National Guard's access to

the Readiness and Environment Protection Initiative, REPI, a program which both ensures the Guard's ability to carry out critical training and also works to conserve the natural habitat surrounding military bases. General Jensen has been a strong advocate for this program and worked with my office to ensure National Guard installations across the Nation have continued access to the REPI Program. This is just one example that demonstrates General Jensen's dedication to service which makes him an outstanding choice to be the next Director of the Army National Guard.

In addition to the outstanding job General Jensen has done running the Minnesota National Guard, he is also inspiring, intelligent, and optimistic—all important qualities in a strong leader and qualities that have helped General Jensen make outstanding contributions throughout his more than 30 years of service. Given his strong qualifications, leadership qualities, and extensive experience, I cannot think of a better candidate to become our Nation's next Director of the Army National Guard.

On behalf of myself and all Minnesotans, thank you for your dedicated service to Minnesota and our Nation. I know you will excel in your new role, and I look forward to continuing to work with you for many years to come. •

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4686. An act to require ride-hailing companies to implement an enhanced digital system to verify passengers with their authorized ride-hailing vehicles and drivers.

H.R. 7027. An act making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7327. An act making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7575. An act to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7608. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, 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. 7027. An act making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 7327. An act making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief

requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 7608. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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-5215. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance under Sections 951A and 954 Regarding Income Subject to a High Rate of Foreign Tax" ((RIN1545-BP15) (TD 9902)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5216. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treasury Decision (TD): Preparer Tax Identification Number (PTIN) User Fee Update" ((RIN1545-BP43) (TD 9903)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5217. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Additional Relief with Respect to Deadlines under Section 501(r)(3) Applicable to Hospital Organizations Affected by the Ongoing Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic" (Notice 2020-56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-229. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia ratifying and affirming the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by the United States Congress on March 22, 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 1

Whereas, a concurrent or joint resolution is a resolution adopted by both houses of a bicameral legislature, which does not require the signature of the chief executive, and a concurrent or joint resolution is sufficient for a state's ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States provides that amendments "shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states"; and

Whereas, over 80 percent of Virginians approve the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment by the Virginia General Assembly; and

Whereas, Virginia has been pivotal to incorporating fundamental rights into the Constitution of the United States, as when Virginia's ratification of 10 amendments in

1791 established the Bill of Rights; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia hereby ratify and affirm the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by the United States Congress on March 22, 1972, and ratified by 37 states legislatures. The complete text of House Joint Resolution 208 proposing the Equal Rights Amendment follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 208

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"Article—

"Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

"Section 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification."; and, be it

Resolved further, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit certified copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation, and the Archivist of the United States at the National Archives and Records Administration of the United States.

POM-230. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia ratifying and affirming the Equal Rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by the United States Congress on March 22, 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 1

Whereas, a concurrent or joint resolution is a resolution adopted by both houses of a bicameral legislature, which does not require the signature of the chief executive, and a concurrent or joint resolution is sufficient for a state's ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States provides that amendments "shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states"; and

Whereas, over 80 percent of Virginians approve the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment by the Virginia General Assembly; and

Whereas, Virginia has been pivotal to incorporating fundamental rights into the Constitution of the United States, as when Virginia's ratification of 10 amendments in 1791 established the Bill of Rights; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia hereby ratify and affirm the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by the United States Congress on

March 22, 1972, and ratified by 37 state legislatures. The complete text of House Joint Resolution 208 proposing the Equal Rights Amendment follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 208

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"Article—

"Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

"Section 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification."; and, be it

Resolved further, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates transmit certified copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation, and the Archivist of the United States at the National Archives and Records Administration of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 4212. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to strip foreign sovereign immunity of certain foreign states to secure justice for victims of novel coronavirus in the United States.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Hala Y. Jarbou, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

David W. Dugan, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois.

Stephen P. McGlynn, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois.

Iain D. Johnston, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Roderick C. Young, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Franklin Ulyses Valderrama, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

(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 Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4370. A bill to designate any alien who is or has been engaged in economic espionage or the misappropriation of trade secrets inadmissible and deportable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4371. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require employers to cash out the flexible spending accounts of employees who separate from employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 4372. A bill to provide for unused benefits in a dependent care FSA to be carried over from 2020 to 2021, to provide for benefits to be accessed after termination of employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4373. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make modifications to the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to apprenticeship and on-job training for participants who become unemployed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 4374. A bill to establish a Government-wide initiative to promote diversity and inclusion in the Federal workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 4375. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent certain telehealth flexibilities under the Medicare program related to the COVID-19 public health emergency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 4376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently allow a tax deduction at the time an investment in qualified property is made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 4377. A bill to facilitate the safe re-opening of schools by conducting or supporting research on children's infection with, and role in transmitting, SARS-CoV-2, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 4378. A bill to provide for a short-term extension of the Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 4379. A bill to extend the period of the temporary authority to extend contracts and leases under the ARMS Initiative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 4380. A bill to provide redress to the employees of Air America; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ROMNEY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 4381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide supplementary 2020 recovery rebates to eligible individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4382. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 4383. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to make projects that directly or indirectly increase the accessibility of affordable, quality child care eligible for certain grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

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; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 4385. A bill to prohibit unfair or deceptive acts or practices in connection with the public health emergency resulting from COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 4386. A bill to decriminalize and reschedule cannabis, to provide for the regulation of cannabis and cannabis products to protect public health and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 4387. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to authorize the Reentry Employment Opportunities Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 4388. A bill to address mental health issues for youth, particularly youth of color, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 4389. A bill to make certain irrigation districts eligible for Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program pumping power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 4390. A bill to establish a grant program to support schools of medicine and schools of osteopathic medicine in underserved areas; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4391. A bill to authorize a public service announcement campaign on the efficacy of cloth face coverings in reducing the spread of COVID-19, to authorize a program to provide

cloth face coverings to any individual in the United States who requests one free of charge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 4392. A bill to provide security assistance and strategic support to Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 4393. A bill to improve the provision of health care and other benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans who were exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. COONS):

S. 4394. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent inventors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4395. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to authorize maritime transportation emergency relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. YOUNG, and Ms. ERNST):

S. Res. 664. A resolution designating the week of September 20 through September 26, 2020, as "Gold Star Families Remembrance Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 665. A resolution reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Mongolia and recognizing the 30th anniversary of democracy in Mongolia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Con. Res. 42. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that August 30, 2020, be observed as the 130th anniversary of the 1890 Land-Grant Educational Institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 800

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for

the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 1126

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 1126, a bill to provide better care for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and their caregivers, while accelerating progress toward prevention strategies, disease modifying treatments, and, ultimately, a cure.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1267

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1267, a bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes.

S. 1334

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1334, a bill authorizing a program to promote innovative approaches to securing prompt access to appropriate care for individuals presenting at emergency departments with acute mental health illness.

S. 1418

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1418, a bill to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1437

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1437, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require that direct-to-consumer advertisements for prescription drugs and biological products include truthful and non-misleading pricing information.

S. 2180

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2180, a bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private land without a warrant, and to make technical corrections.

S. 2711

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2711, a bill to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing-related misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 2741

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2741, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 2842

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 3250

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3250, a bill to ensure U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, agents, and other personnel have adequate synthetic opioid detection equipment, that the Department of Homeland Security has a process to update synthetic opioid detection capability, and for other purposes.

S. 3353

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3353, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3353, *supra*.

S. 3612

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3612, a bill to clarify for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that receipt of coronavirus assistance does not affect the tax treatment of ordinary business expenses.

S. 3652

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3652, a bill to allow 2020 recovery rebates with respect to qualifying children over the age of 16 and other dependents.

S. 3658

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3658, a bill to establish an Office of Equal Rights and Community Inclusion at the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes.

S. 3722

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3722, a bill to authorize funding for a bilateral cooperative program with Israel for the development of health technologies with a focus on combating COVID-19.

S. 3806

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3806, a bill to waive cost share requirements for certain Federal assistance provided under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

S. 3814

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3814, a bill to establish a loan program for businesses affected by COVID-19 and to extend the loan forgiveness period for paycheck protection program loans made to the hardest hit businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 3850

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3850, a bill to require the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to collect and report certain data concerning COVID-19.

S. 3900

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) 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. 3998

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3998, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to simplify payments for telehealth services furnished by Federally qualified health centers or rural health clinics under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 4075

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. 4075, a bill to amend the

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for the release of certain Federal interests in connection with certain grants under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4085

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4085, a bill to make certain States and political subdivisions of States ineligible to receive Federal finance assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 4100

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4100, a bill to support children with disabilities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

S. 4150

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) 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. 4152

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4152, a bill to provide for the adjustment or modification by the Secretary of Agriculture of loans for critical rural utility service providers, and for other purposes.

S. 4174

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 4174, a bill to provide emergency appropriations to the United States Postal Service to cover losses related to the COVID-19 crisis and to direct the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service to develop a plan for ensuring the long term solvency of the Postal Service.

S. 4186

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from

Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4186, a bill to provide grants to States that do not suspend, revoke, or refuse to renew a driver's license of a person or refuse to renew a registration of a motor vehicle for failure to pay a civil or criminal fine or fee, and for other purposes.

S. 4258

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 4258, a bill to establish a grant program for small live venue operators and talent representatives.

S. 4295

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4295, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure access to certain drugs and devices under the Medicare program.

S. 4308

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4308, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to include special districts in the coronavirus relief fund, to direct the Secretary to include special districts as an eligible issuer under the Municipal Liquidity Facility, and for other purposes.

S. 4310

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4310, a bill to prohibit in-person instructional requirements during the COVID-19 emergency.

S. 4317

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 4317, a bill to lessen the burdens on interstate commerce by discouraging insubstantial lawsuits relating to COVID-19 while preserving the ability of individuals and businesses that have suffered real injury to obtain complete relief.

S. 4328

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4328, a bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and report on data quality, sharing, transparency, access, and analysis.

S. RES. 509

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 509, a resolution calling upon the United Nations Security

Council to adopt a resolution on Iran that extends the dates by which Annex B restrictions under Resolution 2231 are currently set to expire.

S. RES. 656

At the request of Mrs. LOEFFLER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 656, a resolution recognizing the importance of the blueberry industry to the United States and designating July 2020 as "National Blueberry Month".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 4375. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent certain telehealth flexibilities under the Medicare program related to the COVID-19 public health emergency; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I want to speak for a few minutes about the changes to telehealth during the last five months—one of the most dramatic developments in the delivery of medical services ever—and why we in Congress should make many of those changes permanent.

I recently heard from a psychiatric nurse practitioner in Nashville who has been seeing patients during the COVID-19 pandemic using telehealth—which means she uses the Internet to see her patients over video or she calls them on the telephone.

She told me about one of her elderly patients who, before the COVID-19 pandemic, got to her appointments by walking from her high-rise apartment to Gallatin Road, catching a bus, and then walking from the bus stop to the clinic.

When the patient got to the clinic, she had to wait for her appointment. Then, when the appointment was over, she had to do all of these steps in reverse to get back home.

Because of telehealth, this nurse said that her patient was in tears out of appreciation that she could now have appointments from her own home. She had access to health care without the long journey, and she could still receive her medications.

The nurse said that several of her other elderly patients have had similar experiences and have asked if they could continue to have access to telehealth in the future, even after the pandemic.

Because of COVID-19, the health care sector and federal and state governments have been forced to cram 10 years' worth of telehealth experience into almost 5 months. In 2016, there were almost 884 million visits nationwide between patients and physicians, according to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Almost all of them were in person—online or remote visits were rare.

During the last four months, the number of online or remote visits virtually exploded. According to Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Vanderbilt went from 10 telehealth visits a

day before the pandemic to more than 2,000 telehealth visits a day across specialties, including primary care, pediatrics, and behavioral health. In less than 3 months, Vanderbilt has provided more than 100,000 telehealth visits.

Before COVID-19, approximately 13,000 Americans enrolled in the traditional Medicare program received telehealth services in an average week. In the last week of April, nearly 1.7 million Americans enrolled in traditional Medicare received telehealth services.

In total, over 9 million Americans in traditional Medicare received a telehealth service between mid-March and mid-June.

The Nashville Journal reports that Tennessee's Centerstone, which provides treatment for mental health and substance use disorders, says it is providing nearly 2,500 telehealth visits per day and 30 percent more of patients are keeping their appointments, which is key to treating these disorders. According to Bob Vero, Centerstone's CEO, "We've taken away a lot of the reasons people don't follow through with their care."

Tim Adams, the CEO of Ascension Saint Thomas Health, which has 9 hospitals in Middle Tennessee and employs over 800 physicians, told me that he predicts that 15-20 percent of the system's visits between patients and physicians will be conducted through telehealth in the future.

In that 15 to 20 percent holds true across the Nation because of telehealth expansion during COVID-19—it would produce a massive change in our health care system.

Congress and the administration reacted to the pandemic by creating a regulatory environment that made the current telehealth boom possible by allowing: in-home virtual visits; telehealth for patients in rural areas at rural health clinics; telehealth from physical therapists, speech language pathologists and other providers; telehealth for many more services including emergency department visits; and allowing Medicare hospice and home dialysis patients to start their care with a virtual visit.

Now Congress is beginning to build on what we've learned and make those changes permanent. Here are three steps Congress should take now, as a part of the COVID-19 legislation that we are working on:

Step One is to pass the COVID-19 HEALS Act legislation that was introduced Monday, which:

Provides telehealth access to part-time and hourly employees; extends the administration's telehealth flexibilities and waivers through the end of the Public Health Emergency, or through 2021; and allows Rural Health Clinics and Federally Qualified Health Centers to continue to provide telehealth to Medicare beneficiaries for 5 years beyond the public health emergency.

Step Two is to pass the CONNECT for Health Act. That legislation explores

ways to expand telehealth services and begins to permanently remove some of the restrictions on where a patient needs to be for telehealth access. The bill is already supported by a broad coalition in the Senate and the House.

Here in the Senate, the CONNECT for Health Act has been led by Senators ROGER WICKER (R-MS), BRIAN SCHATZ (D-HI), CINDY HYDE-SMITH (R-MS), BEN CARDIN (D-MD), JOHN THUNE (R-SD), and MARK WARNER (D-VA)—and today the bill has 38 cosponsors in the Senate.

This bill was first introduced in 2016 and these senators deserve great credit for seeing the need to expand permanently telehealth services even before the pandemic forced a massive change in how Americans receive health care from their doctors.

Step Three would be to pass the bill I'm introducing today which would go further than either of those first two steps and would make permanent in-home visits and rural telehealth access. The bill would also give the Secretary authority to make permanent other changes that the Administration has made over the last few months.

Here's what the bill being introduced today does:

Ensures that patients can access telehealth anywhere by permanently removing Medicare's so-called "geographic and originating site" restrictions, which required both that the patient live in a rural area and use telehealth at a doctor's office or clinic.

Congress temporarily ended these restrictions in the Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplemental Appropriations Act that was signed into law on March 6, allowing millions of Americans to talk with their doctor virtually during the pandemic.

Making this change permanent will ensure Medicare beneficiaries do not lose that ability when the pandemic ends.

Protects access to telehealth for patients in rural areas. The bill makes permanent a change allowing Medicare beneficiaries to continue receiving telehealth services from Rural Health Clinics or Federally Qualified Health Centers.

Telehealth access is especially important for patients in rural and other medically underserved areas because they no longer have to travel to see their primary care doctor.

Those are two changes that this bill would make permanent.

Then it would give the Secretary of Health and Human Services new authorities to do these three things:

Help patients continue to access telehealth from physical therapists, speech language pathologists, and other health care providers.

The bill gives authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to allow Medicare to permanently expand the types of health care providers that can offer telehealth services.

Before COVID-19, only doctors, nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and

certain other practitioners could deliver telehealth services.

Today a much wider range of health practitioners are providing telehealth services.

Help give Medicare recipients many more telehealth services.

The bill gives authority to the HHS Secretary to give Medicare the flexibility to reimburse for more telehealth services.

During the pandemic, Medicare has been reimbursing for 135 telehealth services, more than doubling the number of telehealth services covered before COVID-19. Examples include emergency department visits, home visits, and physical, occupational and speech therapy services. Help Medicare hospice and home dialysis patients begin receiving care through a telehealth appointment.

Medicare requires a face-to-face visit when a patient begins hospice and home dialysis care, and this change would provide authority to the HHS Secretary to allow a telehealth visit to fulfill the requirement for an in-person visit. This will provide flexibility to improve access for these patients and account for individual circumstances. This legislation is the result of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing on June 17, during which senators asked health care experts about the 31 temporary Federal policy changes made in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The legislation I am introducing today incorporates the recommendations of those experts to make permanent 5 of the most important changes—and helps to ensure that patients do not lose the benefits that they have gained from using telehealth during the COVID-19 pandemic.

This bill would make permanent the telehealth changes in the legislation introduced Monday as well as the CONNECT for Health Act. The best result for the American people would be for Congress to approve all three steps—the changes in the HEALS Act, the CONNECT for Health Act, and my legislation—in the next COVID-19 package so we don't miss the opportunity to support and encourage one of the most important changes in the delivery of medical services ever.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 4390. A bill to establish a grant program to support schools of medicine and schools of osteopathic medicine in underserved areas; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, communities of color and those living in rural and underserved area face significant barriers to healthcare, including physician shortages. Unfortunately, in many communities of color and rural areas, there are few pathways to enter the medical profession. Recent data shows that while medical school enrollment

is up by 30 percent, the number of students from rural areas entering medical school declined by 28 percent between 2002 and 2017, with only 4.3 percent of all incoming medical students coming from rural areas in 2017. Similarly, Black, Hispanic/Latino, and Native American students face several barriers to matriculate and graduate from medical school. This exacerbates the barriers to care and the disparities in health outcomes that these communities experience. It is critical that we expand the diversity of our physician workforce to tackle the rampant disparities and systemic biases within our healthcare system.

This is why I am introducing the Expanding Medical Education Act, which aims to tackle the lack of representation of rural students, underserved students, and students of color in the physician pipeline by encouraging the recruitment, enrollment, and retention of students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The bill would provide grants through the Health Resources and Services Administration, HRSA to colleges and universities to establish or expand allopathic or osteopathic medical schools in underserved areas or at minority-serving institutions, including historically Black colleges and universities, HBCU. These grants can be used for planning and construction of a medical school in an area in which no other school is based; hiring diverse faculty and staff; recruitment, enrollment, and retention of students; and other purposes to ensure increased representation of rural students, underserved students, and students of color in our physician workforce.

Our rural communities and communities of color face significant challenges in access to healthcare. It is time our physician workforce reflected these communities. We need to diversify our physician pipeline and change the disparity in representation, and this bill will help get us there. I hope the Senate passes this legislation quickly to expand the diversity of the medical profession and to take a step towards improved access to care for our marginalized communities.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 664—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 20 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 26, 2020, AS “GOLD STAR FAMILIES REMEMBRANCE WEEK”

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. YOUNG, and Ms. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 664

Whereas the last Sunday in September—
(1) is designated as “Gold Star Mother’s Day” under section 111 of title 36, United States Code; and

(2) was first designated as “Gold Star Mother’s Day” under the Joint Resolution entitled “Joint Resolution designating the last Sunday in September as ‘Gold Star Mother’s Day’, and for other purposes”, approved June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1895);

Whereas there is no date dedicated to families affected by the loss of a loved one who died in service to the United States;

Whereas a gold star symbolizes a family member who died in the line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas the members and veterans of the Armed Forces, through their service, bear the burden of protecting the freedom of the people of the United States;

Whereas the selfless example of the service of the members and veterans of the Armed Forces, as well as the sacrifices made by the families of those individuals, inspires all individuals in the United States to sacrifice and work diligently for the good of the United States; and

Whereas the sacrifices of the families of the fallen members of the Armed Forces and the families of veterans of the Armed Forces should never be forgotten: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 20 through September 26, 2020, as “Gold Star Families Remembrance Week”;

(2) honors and recognizes the sacrifices made by—

(A) the families of members of the Armed Forces who made the ultimate sacrifice in order to defend freedom and protect the United States; and

(B) the families of veterans of the Armed Forces; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe Gold Star Families Remembrance Week by—

(A) performing acts of service and good will in their communities; and

(B) celebrating families in which loved ones made the ultimate sacrifice so that others could continue to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

SENATE RESOLUTION 665—RE-AFFIRMING THE STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MONGOLIA AND RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF DEMOCRACY IN MONGOLIA

Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 665

Whereas the United States and Mongolia established diplomatic relations in January 1987, and since that time the relationship has grown stronger based on shared strategic interests, security cooperation, democratic values, good governance, and respect for human rights;

Whereas, since its peaceful democratic revolution in 1989, through a series of initiatives, Mongolia has charted a successful path to multiparty democracy and a free market economy;

Whereas, in 1990, the Government of Mongolia declared an end to a one-party, authoritarian, political system and adopted democratic and free market reforms;

Whereas, in 1992, Mongolia adopted a constitution establishing a parliamentary democracy, becoming the first country in Asia to transition from communism to democracy;

Whereas Mongolia has shown its commitment to a “third neighbor” relationship with

the United States by sending troops to support United States operations in Iraq from 2003 through 2008 and Afghanistan since 2009, and Mongolia has a strong record of troop contributions to international peacekeeping missions;

Whereas successive Mongolian governments have taken notable steps to strengthen civil society, battle corruption, and spur economic development;

Whereas the Parliament of Mongolia, the State Great Khural, has engaged with Congress, including through the House Democracy Partnership, thereby promoting responsive and effective governance through peer-to-peer cooperation;

Whereas Mongolia began as a partner to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in 2004, graduated to become a participating state in 2012, and participates actively in the work of the OSCE for stability, peace, and democracy;

Whereas Mongolia has regularly invited the OSCE and other organizations to send monitoring teams for its presidential and parliamentary elections;

Whereas Mongolia has also been an active member of the Community of Democracies (CoD), a global coalition of states that support adherence to common democratic values and standards, and Mongolia has not only remained active since the founding of the CoD in 2000, but successfully chaired the CoD from 2011 through 2013;

Whereas, in addition to supporting the OSCE and CoD, Mongolia supports democratic initiatives while participating in a wide range of other global institutions;

Whereas, most recently, on June 24, 2020, Mongolia successfully organized parliamentary elections, strengthening its commitment to democracy and the rule of law;

Whereas the success of Mongolia as a democracy and its strategic location, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and ability to pursue an independent foreign policy are highly relevant to the national security of the United States;

Whereas the United States has provided support to Mongolia through the Millennium Challenge Corporation through an initial compact signed in 2007 designed to increase economic growth and reduce poverty and a second compact signed in 2018 involving investments in water infrastructure, including supply and wastewater recycling, as well as water sector sustainability;

Whereas, on September 20, 2018, the United States and Mongolia signed a joint statement and the Roadmap for Expanded Economic Partnership, outlining the intent to deepen the bilateral commercial relationship through full implementation of the obligations under the Agreement on Transparency in Matters Related to International Trade and Investment between the United States of America and Mongolia, signed at New York September 24, 2013 (in this preamble referred to as the “United States-Mongolia Transparency Agreement”), and to collaborate in supporting Mongolian small- and medium-sized enterprises through various programs and projects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, trade between the United States and Mongolia is modest but growing, with total trade in 2019 between the two countries of approximately \$217,500,000, including \$192,700,000 in United States exports to Mongolia and \$24,800,000 in United States imports from Mongolia;

Whereas Mongolia is a beneficiary country under the Generalized System of Preferences program, but its use of the program remains low, as, in 2018, only \$3,300,000 of exports from Mongolia to the United States were under the program; and

Whereas, on July 31, 2019, the United States and Mongolia declared the bilateral relationship a Strategic Partnership and noted the shared desire—

(1) to intensify cooperation as strong democracies based on the rule of law through safeguarding and promoting democratic values and human rights, including the freedoms of religion or belief, expression, including internet and media freedom, assembly, and association, anticorruption and fiscal transparency, and youth and emerging leader development;

(2) to cooperate in promoting national security and stability across the Indo-Pacific region so that all countries, secure in their sovereignty, are able to pursue economic growth consistent with international law and principles of fair competition;

(3) to deepen national security and law-enforcement ties through collaboration on bilateral and multilateral security, judicial, and law-enforcement efforts in the region;

(4) to strengthen cooperation in multilateral engagements such as peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and disaster preparedness and relief operations;

(5) to expand trade and investment relations on a fair and reciprocal basis, support private sector-led growth, fully implement the United States-Mongolia Transparency Agreement, promote women's entrepreneurship, and continue to explore support for infrastructure under the new United States International Development Finance Corporation with the new tools provided under the BUILD Act of 2018 (22 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.);

(6) to strengthen border security, prevent illegal transshipment and trafficking, expand cooperation on civil aviation safety and oversight, and efficiently facilitate legitimate travel between Mongolia and the United States;

(7) to increase cooperation in addressing transnational threats such as terrorism, human trafficking, drug trafficking, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyberattacks, transnational organized crime, pandemics, and other emerging nontraditional security threats;

(8) to continue to develop an environment in which civil society, social media, and a free and independent media can flourish; and

(9) to maintain high-level official dialogues, encourage bilateral exchanges at all levels of government, and further develop people-to-people exchanges to deepen engagement on issues of mutual interest and concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of the relationship between the United States and Mongolia and remains committed to advancing this Strategic Partnership in the future;

(2) emphasizes the importance of free and fair elections in Mongolia;

(3) applauds the continued engagement of Mongolia in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Community of Democracies, congressional-parliamentary partnerships, including continued high-level parliamentary exchange, and other institutions that promote democratic values, which reinforces the commitment of the people and the Government of Mongolia to those values and standards;

(4) encourages the United States Government to help Mongolia use its benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences program and other relevant programs to increase trade between the United States and Mongolia;

(5) urges the United States International Development Finance Corporation to expand activities in Mongolia to support economic development, diversification of the economy of Mongolia, and women-owned small- and medium-sized enterprises;

(6) urges private and public support to help diversify the economy of Mongolia through increased cooperation and investments, as well as infrastructure and other vital projects;

(7) urges the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and other relevant agencies to continue to support Mongolia's democratic and economic development and efforts on anticorruption;

(8) reaffirms the importance of civil society to the continued democratic development of Mongolia;

(9) encourages the Government of Mongolia to build a regulatory system that supports and encourages the growth and operation of independent nongovernmental organizations and continues to pursue policies of transparency that uphold democratic values; and

(10) encourages the Government of Mongolia to continue legal reform, institutional capacity building, and to improve the independence of other democratic institutions.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 42—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT AUGUST 30, 2020, BE OBSERVED AS THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1890 LAND-GRANT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

S. CON. RES. 42

Whereas the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.), popularly known as the "Second Morrill Act", led to the creation of 19 historically Black Federal land-grant educational institutions;

Whereas the 19 historically Black 1890 land-grant educational institutions are identified as Lincoln University, Alcorn State University, the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, Alabama A&M University, Prairie View A&M University, Southern University, Virginia State University, Kentucky State University, the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, Florida A&M University, Delaware State University, North Carolina A&T State University, Fort Valley State University, South Carolina State University, Langston University, Tennessee State University, Tuskegee University, Central State University, and West Virginia State University;

Whereas the Act of May 8, 1914 (7 U.S.C. 341), popularly known as the "Smith-Lever Act", provided for the establishment of the Cooperative Extension Service within the Department of Agriculture for the dissemination, through Federal land-grant educational institutions, of information pertaining to agriculture and home economics;

Whereas, since the 125th Anniversary of the 19 historically Black 1890 land-grant educational institutions in 2015, Congress passed the 2018 Farm Bill which included new Federal investments, such as—

(1) the program providing scholarships for students at 1890 land-grant educational institutions under section 1446 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 322a); and

(2) the recognition of at least 3 Centers of Excellence at 1890 land-grant educational in-

stitutions under section 1673(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5926(d)); and

Whereas appropriate recognition should be given to the significant contributions made by the 19 historically Black 1890 land-grant educational institutions to the heritage, educational development, advancement, and agricultural strength of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the 130th anniversary of the 1890 Land-Grant Educational Institutions should be observed;

(2) such a day should be observed with appropriate ceremonies and activities to recognize the collective contributions that these 19 historically Black Federal land-grant educational institutions have made to the United States;

(3) the Second Morrill Act and the Smith-Lever Act have helped the United States develop agricultural leaders; and

(4) the Department of Agriculture and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture should remain committed to supporting the goals of the Second Morrill Act and the Smith-Lever Act.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2499. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 178, to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

SA 2500. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Ms. CANTWELL) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 529, to establish a national program to identify and reduce losses from landslide hazards, to establish a national 3D Elevation Program, and for other purposes.

SA 2501. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. WICKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 914, to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and to require the establishment of a National Water Center, and for other purposes.

SA 2502. Mr. SULLIVAN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 850, to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2499. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 178, to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Coronavirus Relief Fair Unemployment Compensation Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 2104(e)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus

Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended by striking “July 31, 2020” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

(b) IMPROVEMENTS TO ACCURACY OF PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2104(b) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “of \$600” and inserting “equal to the amount specified in paragraph (3)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) AMOUNT OF FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount specified in this paragraph is the following amount with respect to an individual:

“(i) For weeks of unemployment beginning after the date on which an agreement is entered into under this section and ending on or before July 31, 2020, \$600.

“(ii) For weeks of unemployment beginning after the last week under clause (i) and ending before December 31, 2020, an amount equal to one of the following, as determined by the State for all individuals:

“(I) \$200.

“(II) An amount (not to exceed \$500) equal to—

“(aa) two-thirds of the individual’s average weekly wages; minus

“(bb) the individual’s base amount (determined prior to any reductions or offsets).

“(B) BASE AMOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘base amount’ means, with respect to an individual, an amount equal to—

“(i) for weeks of unemployment under the pandemic unemployment assistance program under section 2102, the amount determined under subsection (d)(1)(A)(i) or (d)(2) of such section 2102, as applicable; or

“(ii) for all other weeks of unemployment, the amount determined under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection.

“(C) AVERAGE WEEKLY WAGES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), for purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘average weekly wages’ means, with respect to an individual, the following:

“(I) If the State computes the individual weekly unemployment compensation benefit amount based on an individual’s average weekly wages in a base period, an amount equal to the individual’s average weekly wages used in such computation.

“(II) If the State computes the individual weekly unemployment compensation benefit amount based on high quarter wages or a formula using wages across some but not all quarters in a base period, an amount equal to $\frac{1}{3}$ of such high quarter wages or average wages of the applicable quarters used in the computation for the individual.

“(III) If the State uses computations other than the computations under subclause (I) or (II) for the individual weekly unemployment compensation benefit amount, or for computations of the weekly benefit amount under the pandemic unemployment assistance program under section 2102, as described in subsection (d)(1)(A)(i) or (d)(2) of such section 2102, for which subclause (I) or (II) do not apply, an amount equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the sum of all base period wages.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—If more than one of the methods of computation under subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of clause (i) are applicable to a State, then such term shall mean the amount determined under the applicable subclause of clause (i) that results in the highest amount of average weekly wages.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 2102(d) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended by inserting “with respect to the individual” after “section 2104” in each of paragraphs (1)(A)(i) and (2).

(B) PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Section 2107 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(4)(A)(ii), by inserting “with respect to the individual” after “section 2104”; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting “with respect to the individual” after “section 2104”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)).

(d) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts provided by this section and the amendments made by this section are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(2) DESIGNATION IN SENATE.—In the Senate, this section and the amendments made by this section are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4112(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

SA 2500. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Ms. CANTWELL) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 529, to establish a national program to identify and reduce losses from landslide hazards, to establish a national 3D Elevation Program, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 42, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 43, line 5, and insert the following:

(h) FUNDING.—For each of fiscal years 2021 and 2024—

(1) there is authorized out of funds appropriated to the United States Geological Survey, \$25,000,000 to carry out this section;

(2) there is authorized out of funds appropriated to the National Science Foundation, \$11,000,000 to carry out this section; and

(3) there is authorized out of funds appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, \$1,000,000 to carry out this section.

On page 51, strike lines 7 through 9 and insert the following:

(e) FUNDING.—For each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2024, there is authorized out of funds appropriated to the Secretary \$20,000,000 to carry out this section.

SA 2501. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. WICKER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 914, to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and to require the establishment of a National Water Center, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Coordinated Ocean Observations and Research Act of 2020”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—REAUTHORIZATION OF INTEGRATED COASTAL AND OCEAN OBSERVATION SYSTEM ACT OF 2009

Sec. 101. Purposes.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

Sec. 103. Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System.

Sec. 104. Financing and agreements.

Sec. 105. Reports to Congress.

Sec. 106. Public-private use policy.

Sec. 107. Repeal of independent cost estimate.

Sec. 108. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 109. Reports and research plans.

Sec. 110. Strategic research plan.

Sec. 111. Stakeholder input on monitoring.

Sec. 112. Research activities.

TITLE II—NAMED STORM EVENT MODEL AND POST-STORM ASSESSMENTS

Sec. 201. Named Storm Event Model and post-storm assessments.

TITLE III—WATER PREDICTION AND FORECASTING

Sec. 301. Water prediction and forecasting.

TITLE I—REAUTHORIZATION OF INTEGRATED COASTAL AND OCEAN OBSERVATION SYSTEM ACT OF 2009

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

Section 12302 of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3601) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 12302. PURPOSES.

“The purposes of this subtitle are—

“(1) to establish and sustain a national integrated System of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes observing systems, comprised of Federal and non-Federal components coordinated at the national level by the Council and at the regional level by a network of regional coastal observing systems, and that includes in situ, remote, and other coastal and ocean observation and modeling capabilities, technologies, data management systems, communication systems, and product development systems, and is designed to address regional and national needs for ocean and coastal information, to gather specific data on key ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes variables, and to ensure timely and sustained dissemination and availability of these data—

“(A) to the public;

“(B) to support national defense, search and rescue operations, marine commerce, navigation safety, weather, climate, and marine forecasting, energy siting and production, economic development, ecosystem-based marine, coastal, and Great Lakes resource management, public safety, and public outreach and education;

“(C) to promote greater public awareness and stewardship of the Nation’s ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources and the general public welfare;

“(D) to provide easy access to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes data and promote data sharing between Federal and non-Federal sources and promote public data sharing;

“(E) to enable advances in scientific understanding to support the sustainable use, conservation, management, and understanding of healthy ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources to ensure the Nation can respond to opportunities to enhance food, economic, and national security; and

“(F) to monitor and model changes in the oceans and Great Lakes, including with respect to chemistry, harmful algal blooms, hypoxia, water levels, and other phenomena;

“(2) to improve the Nation’s capability to measure, track, observe, understand, and predict events related directly and indirectly

to weather and climate, natural climate variability, and interactions between the oceanic and atmospheric environments, including the Great Lakes;

“(3) to sustain, upgrade, and modernize the Nation’s ocean and Great Lakes observing infrastructure to detect changes and ensure delivery of reliable and timely information; and

“(4) to authorize activities—

“(A) to promote basic and applied research to develop, test, and deploy innovations and improvements in coastal and ocean observation technologies, including advanced observing technologies such as unmanned maritime systems needed to address critical data gaps, modeling systems, other scientific and technological capabilities to improve the understanding of weather and climate, ocean-atmosphere dynamics, global climate change, and the physical, chemical, and biological dynamics of the ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes environments; and

“(B) to conserve healthy and restore degraded coastal ecosystems.”.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 12303 of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3602) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 7902” and inserting “section 8932”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking “integrated into the System and are managed through States, regional organizations, universities, nongovernmental organizations, or the private sector” and inserting “managed through States, regional organizations, universities, nongovernmental organizations, or the private sector and integrated into the System by a regional coastal observing system, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the agencies participating in the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee”;

(3) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) REGIONAL COASTAL OBSERVING SYSTEM.—The term ‘regional coastal observing system’ means an organizational body that is certified or established by contract or memorandum by the lead Federal agency designated in section 12304(c)(3) and coordinates State, Federal, local, tribal, and private interests at a regional level with the responsibility of engaging the private and public sectors in designing, operating, and improving regional coastal observing systems in order to ensure the provision of data and information that meet the needs of user groups from the respective regions.”; and

(4) in paragraph (7), by striking “National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration” and inserting “Administrator”.

SEC. 103. INTEGRATED COASTAL AND OCEAN OBSERVATION SYSTEM.

(a) SYSTEM ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 12304(b) of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3603(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to fulfill the purposes of this subtitle, the System shall be national in scope and consist of—

“(A) Federal assets to fulfill national and international observation missions and priorities;

“(B) non-Federal assets, including a network of regional coastal observing systems identified under subsection (c)(4), to fulfill regional and national observation missions and priorities;

“(C) observing, modeling, data management, and communication systems for the timely integration and dissemination of data and information products from the System, including reviews of data collection proce-

dures across regions and programs to make recommendations for data collection standards across the System to meet national ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes observation, applied research, and weather forecasting needs;

“(D) a product development system to transform observations into products in a format that may be readily used and understood; and

“(E) a research and development program conducted under the guidance of the Council, consisting of—

“(i) basic and applied research and technology development—

“(I) to improve understanding of coastal and ocean systems and their relationships to human activities; and

“(II) to ensure improvement of operational assets and products, including related infrastructure, observing technologies such as unmanned maritime systems, and information and data processing and management technologies;

“(ii) an advanced observing technology development program to fill gaps in technology;

“(iii) large scale computing resources and research to advance modeling of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes processes;

“(iv) models to improve regional weather forecasting capabilities and regional weather forecasting products; and

“(v) reviews of data collection procedures across regions and programs to make recommendations for data collection standards across the System to meet national ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes observation, applied research, and weather forecasting needs.”.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—Section 12304(b)(3) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 3603(b)(3)) is amended by inserting “for research and for use in the development of products to address societal needs” before the period at the end.

(b) POLICY OVERSIGHT, ADMINISTRATION, AND REGIONAL COORDINATION.—Section 12304(c) of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3603(c)) is amended by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), and inserting the following:

“(2) INTERAGENCY OCEAN OBSERVATION COMMITTEE.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Council shall establish or designate a committee, which shall be known as the ‘Interagency Ocean Observation Committee’.

“(B) DUTIES.—The Interagency Ocean Observation Committee shall—

“(i) prepare annual and long-term plans for consideration and approval by the Council for the integrated design, operation, maintenance, enhancement, and expansion of the System to meet the objectives of this subtitle and the System Plan;

“(ii) develop and transmit to Congress, along with the budget submitted by the President to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, an annual coordinated, comprehensive budget—

“(I) to operate all elements of the System identified in subsection (b); and

“(II) to ensure continuity of data streams from Federal and non-Federal assets;

“(iii) establish requirements for observation data variables to be gathered by both Federal and non-Federal assets and identify, in consultation with regional coastal observing systems, priorities for System observations;

“(iv) establish and define protocols and standards for System data processing, management, collection, configuration standards, formats, and communication for new and existing assets throughout the System network;

“(v) develop contract requirements for each regional coastal observing system—

“(I) to establish eligibility for integration into the System;

“(II) to ensure compliance with all applicable standards and protocols established by the Council; and

“(III) to ensure that regional observations are integrated into the System on a sustained basis;

“(vi) identify gaps in observation coverage or needs for capital improvements of both Federal assets and non-Federal assets;

“(vii) subject to the availability of appropriations, establish through 1 or more Federal agencies participating in the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee, in consultation with the System advisory committee established under subsection (d), a competitive matching grant or other programs—

“(I) to promote intramural and extramural research and development of new, innovative, and emerging observation technologies including testing and field trials; and

“(II) to facilitate the migration of new, innovative, and emerging scientific and technological advances from research and development to operational deployment;

“(viii) periodically—

“(I) review the System Plan; and

“(II) submit to the Council such recommendations as the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee may have for improvements to the System Plan;

“(ix) ensure collaboration among Federal agencies participating in the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee; and

“(x) perform such additional duties as the Council may delegate.

“(3) LEAD FEDERAL AGENCY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall function as the lead Federal agency for the implementation and administration of the System.

“(B) CONSULTATION REQUIRED.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Administrator shall consult with the Council, the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee, other Federal agencies that maintain portions of the System, and the regional coastal observing systems.

“(C) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Administrator shall—

“(i) establish and operate an Integrated Ocean Observing System Program Office within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that—

“(I) utilizes, to the extent necessary, personnel from Federal agencies participating in the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee; and

“(II) oversees daily operations and coordination of the System;

“(ii) implement policies, protocols, and standards approved by the Council and delegated by the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee;

“(iii) promulgate program guidelines—

“(I) to certify and integrate regional associations into the System; and

“(II) to provide regional coastal and ocean observation data that meet the needs of user groups from the respective regions;

“(iv) have the authority to enter into and oversee contracts, leases, grants, or cooperative agreements with non-Federal assets, including regional coastal observing systems, to support the purposes of this subtitle on such terms as the Administrator deems appropriate;

“(v) implement and maintain a merit-based, competitive funding process to support non-Federal assets, including the development and maintenance of a national network of regional coastal observing systems, and develop and implement a process for the

periodic review and evaluation of the regional associations;

“(vi) provide opportunities for competitive contracts and grants for demonstration projects to design, develop, integrate, deploy, maintain, and support components of the System;

“(vii) establish and maintain efficient and effective administrative procedures for the timely allocation of funds among contractors, grantees, and non-Federal assets, including regional coastal observing systems;

“(viii) develop and implement a process for the periodic review and evaluation of the regional coastal observing systems;

“(ix) formulate an annual process by which gaps in observation coverage or needs for capital improvements of Federal assets and non-Federal assets of the System are—

“(I) identified by the regional associations described in the System Plan, the Administrator, or other members of the System; and

“(II) submitted to the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee;

“(x) develop and be responsible for a data management and communication system, in accordance with standards and protocols established by the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee, by which all data collected by the System regarding ocean and coastal waters of the United States including the Great Lakes, are processed, stored, integrated, and made available to all end-user communities;

“(xi) not less frequently than once each year, submit to the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee a report on the accomplishments, operational needs, and performance of the System to contribute to the annual and long-term plans prepared pursuant to paragraph (2)(B)(i);

“(xii) develop and periodically update a plan to efficiently integrate into the System new, innovative, or emerging technologies that have been demonstrated to be useful to the System and which will fulfill the purposes of this subtitle and the System Plan; and

“(xiii) work with users and regional associations to develop products to enable real-time data sharing for decision makers, including with respect to weather forecasting and modeling, search and rescue operations, corrosive seawater forecasts, water quality monitoring and communication, and harmful algal bloom forecasting.

“(4) REGIONAL COASTAL OBSERVING SYSTEMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A regional coastal observing system described in the System Plan as a regional association may not be certified or established under this subtitle unless it—

“(i) has been or shall be certified or established by contract or agreement by the Administrator;

“(ii) meets—

“(I) the certification standards and compliance procedure guidelines issued by the Administrator; and

“(II) the information needs of user groups in the region while adhering to national standards;

“(iii) demonstrates an organizational structure, that under funding limitations is capable of—

“(I) gathering required System observation data;

“(II) supporting and integrating all aspects of coastal and ocean observing and information programs within a region; and

“(III) reflecting the needs of State, local, and tribal governments, commercial interests, and other users and beneficiaries of the System and other requirements specified under this subtitle and the System Plan;

“(iv) identifies—

“(I) gaps in observation coverage needs for capital improvements of Federal assets and non-Federal assets of the System; and

“(II) other recommendations to assist in the development of the annual and long-term plans prepared pursuant to paragraph (2)(B)(i) and transmits such information to the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee through the Program Office established under paragraph (3)(C)(i);

“(v) develops and operates under a strategic plan that will ensure the efficient and effective administration of programs and assets to support daily data observations for integration into the System, pursuant to the standards approved by the Council;

“(vi) works cooperatively with governmental and nongovernmental entities at all levels to identify and provide information products of the System for multiple users within the service area of the regional coastal observing system; and

“(vii) complies with all financial oversight requirements established by the Administrator, including requirements relating to audits.

“(B) PARTICIPATION.—For the purposes of this subtitle, employees of Federal agencies are permitted to be members of the governing body for the regional coastal observing systems and may participate in the functions of the regional coastal observing systems.”

(c) SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 12304(d) of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3603(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “or the Interagency Ocean Observing Committee,” and inserting “or the Council under this subtitle”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, data sharing,” after “data management”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) additional priorities, including—

“(i) a national surface current mapping network designed to improve fine scale sea surface mapping using high frequency radar technology and other emerging technologies to address national priorities, including Coast Guard search and rescue operation planning and harmful algal bloom forecasting and detection that—

“(I) is comprised of existing high frequency radar and other sea surface current mapping infrastructure operated by national programs and regional coastal observing systems;

“(II) incorporates new high frequency radar assets or other fine scale sea surface mapping technology assets, and other assets needed to fill gaps in coverage on United States coastlines; and

“(III) follows a deployment plan that prioritizes closing gaps in high frequency radar infrastructure in the United States, starting with areas demonstrating significant sea surface current data needs, especially in areas where additional data will improve Coast Guard search and rescue models;

“(ii) fleet acquisition for unmanned maritime systems for deployment and data integration to fulfill the purposes of this subtitle;

“(iii) an integrative survey program for application of unmanned maritime systems to the real-time or near real-time collection and transmission of sea floor, water column, and sea surface data on biology, chemistry, geology, physics, and hydrography;

“(iv) remote sensing and data assimilation to develop new analytical methodologies to assimilate data from the System into hydrodynamic models;

“(v) integrated, multi-State monitoring to assess sources, movement, and fate of sediments in coastal regions;

“(vi) a multi-region marine sound monitoring system to be—

“(I) planned in consultation with the Interagency Ocean Observation Committee, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Department of the Navy, and academic research institutions; and

“(II) developed, installed, and operated in coordination with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Department of the Navy, and academic research institutions; and

“(E) any other purpose identified by the Administrator or the Council.”;

(D) in paragraph (3)(B), by inserting “The Administrator may stagger the terms of the System advisory committee members.” before “Members”; and

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and the Interagency Ocean Observing Committee”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “Observing” and inserting “Observation”.

(d) CIVIL LIABILITY.—Section 12304(e) of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3603(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “information coordination entity” each place it appears and inserting “coastal observing system”; and

(2) by striking “contract, lease, grant, or cooperative agreement under subsection (c)(3)(D)” and inserting “a memorandum of agreement of certification under subsection (c)(3)(C)(iii)”.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) is amended by striking “regional information coordination entities” each place it appears and inserting “regional coastal observing systems”.

SEC. 104. FINANCING AND AGREEMENTS.

Section 12305(a) of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3604(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce may execute an agreement, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, with any State or subdivision thereof, any Federal agency, any public or private organization, or any individual to carry out activities under this subtitle.”

SEC. 105. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 12307 of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3606) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 12307. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than March 30, 2022, and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall prepare, and the President acting through the Council shall approve and transmit to Congress, a report on progress made in implementing this subtitle.

“(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include—

“(1) a description of activities carried out under this subtitle and the System Plan;

“(2) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the System, including an evaluation of progress made by the Council to achieve the goals identified under the System Plan;

“(3) the identification of Federal and non-Federal assets as determined by the Council that have been integrated into the System, including assets essential to the gathering of required observation data variables necessary to meet the respective missions of Council agencies;

“(4) a review of procurements, planned or initiated, by each department or agency represented on the Council to enhance, expand,

or modernize the observation capabilities and data products provided by the System, including data management and communication subsystems;

“(5) a summary of the existing gaps in observation infrastructure and monitoring data collection, including—

“(A) priorities considered by the System advisory committee;

“(B) the national sea surface current mapping network;

“(C) coastal buoys;

“(D) ocean chemistry monitoring;

“(E) marine sound monitoring; and

“(F) unmanned maritime systems technology gaps;

“(6) an assessment regarding activities to integrate Federal and non-Federal assets, nationally and on the regional level, and discussion of the performance and effectiveness of regional coastal observing systems to coordinate regional observation operations;

“(7) a description of benefits of the program to users of data products resulting from the System (including the general public, industries, scientists, resource managers, emergency responders, policy makers, and educators);

“(8) recommendations, if any, concerning—

“(A) modifications to the System; and

“(B) funding levels for the System in subsequent fiscal years; and

“(9) the results of a periodic external independent programmatic audit of the System.”

SEC. 106. PUBLIC-PRIVATE USE POLICY.

Section 12308 of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3607) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 12308. PUBLIC-PRIVATE USE POLICY.

“The Council shall maintain a policy that defines processes for making decisions about the roles of the Federal Government, the States, regional coastal observing systems, the academic community, and the private sector in providing to end-user communities environmental information, products, technologies, and services related to the System. The Administrator shall ensure that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration adheres to the decision making process developed by the Council regarding the roles of the Federal Government, the States, the regional coastal observing systems, the academic community, and the private sector in providing end-user communities environmental information, data products, technologies, and services related to the System.”

SEC. 107. REPEAL OF INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) is amended by striking section 12309 (33 U.S.C. 3608).

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 991) is amended by striking the item related to section 12309.

SEC. 108. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 12311 of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3610) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 12311. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to support the integrated oceans observations under this subtitle—

“(1) \$48,000,000 for fiscal year 2021;

“(2) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2022;

“(3) \$52,000,000 for fiscal year 2023;

“(4) \$54,000,000 for fiscal year 2024; and

“(5) \$56,000,000 for fiscal year 2025.”

SEC. 109. REPORTS AND RESEARCH PLANS.

Section 12404(c) of the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act

of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3703(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) ECONOMIC VULNERABILITY REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Coordinated Ocean Observations and Research Act of 2020, and every 6 years thereafter, the Subcommittee shall transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that—

“(i) is named the ‘Ocean Chemistry Coastal Community Vulnerability Assessment’;

“(ii) identifies gaps in ocean acidification monitoring by public, academic, and private assets in the network of regional coastal observing systems;

“(iii) identifies geographic areas which have gaps in ocean acidification research;

“(iv) identifies United States coastal communities, including island communities, fishing communities, low-population rural communities, tribal and subsistence communities, and island communities, that may be impacted by ocean acidification;

“(v) identifies impacts of changing ocean carbonate chemistry on the communities described in clause (iv), including impacts from changes in ocean and coastal marine resources that are not managed by the Federal Government;

“(vi) identifies gaps in understanding of the impacts of ocean acidification on economically or commercially important species, particularly those which support United States commercial, recreational, and tribal fisheries and aquaculture;

“(vii) identifies habitats that may be particularly vulnerable to corrosive sea water, including areas experiencing multiple stressors such as hypoxia, sedimentation, and harmful algal blooms;

“(viii) identifies areas in which existing National Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System assets, including unmanned maritime systems, may be leveraged as platforms for the deployment of new sensors or other applicable observing technologies;

“(ix) is written in collaboration with Federal agencies responsible for carrying out this subtitle, including representatives of—

“(I) the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Office for Coastal Management of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

“(II) regional coastal observing systems established under section 12304(c)(4);

“(III) regional ocean acidification networks; and

“(IV) sea grant programs (as defined in section 203 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1122)); and

“(x) is written in consultation with experts, including subsistence users, academia, and stakeholders familiar with the economic, social, ecological, geographic, and resource concerns of coastal communities in the United States.

“(B) FORM OF REPORT.—

“(i) INITIAL REPORT.—The initial report required under subparagraph (A) shall include the information described in clauses (i) through (viii) of that subparagraph on a national level.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—Each report required under subparagraph (A) after the initial report—

“(I) may describe the information described in clauses (i) through (viii) of that subparagraph on a national level; or

“(II) may consist of separate reports for each region of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

“(iii) REGIONAL REPORTS.—If the Subcommittee opts to prepare a report required under subparagraph (A) as separate regional reports under clause (ii)(II), the Subcommittee shall submit a report for each re-

gion of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration not less frequently than once during each 6-year reporting period.

“(C) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this paragraph and in paragraph (5), the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

“(5) MONITORING PRIORITIZATION PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the submission of the initial report under paragraph (4)(A), the Subcommittee shall transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that develops a plan to deploy new sensors or other applicable observing technologies such as unmanned maritime systems—

“(A) based on such initial report;

“(B) prioritized by—

“(i) the threat to coastal economies and ecosystems;

“(ii) gaps in data; and

“(iii) research needs; and

“(C) that leverage existing platforms, where possible.”

SEC. 110. STRATEGIC RESEARCH PLAN.

(a) CONTENTS.—Section 12405(b) of the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3704(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) make recommendations for research to be conducted, including in the social sciences and economics, to address the key knowledge gaps identified in the Ocean Chemistry Coastal Community Vulnerability Assessment conducted under section 12404(c)(4).”

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Section 12405(c) of the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3704(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) Research to understand the combined impact of changes in ocean chemistry and other stressors, including sediment delivery, hypoxia, and harmful algal blooms, on each other and on living marine resources, including aquaculture and coastal ecosystems.

“(7) Applied research to identify adaptation strategies for species impacted by changes in ocean chemistry including vegetation-based systems, shell recycling, species and genetic diversity, applied technologies, aquaculture methodologies, and management recommendations.”

(c) PARTICIPATION.—Section 12405(e) of the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3704(e)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting “, tribal governments, and subsistence users” after “groups”.

(d) REVISED STRATEGIC RESEARCH PLAN.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology of the National Science and Technology Council shall submit to Congress a revised strategic research plan under section 12405 of the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3704) that includes the matters required by the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 111. STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON MONITORING.

Section 12406(a) of the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3705(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) includes an ongoing mechanism that allows industry members, coastal stakeholders, fishery management councils and commissions, non-Federal resource managers, community acidification networks, indigenous knowledge groups, and scientific experts to provide input on monitoring needs that are necessary to support on the ground management, decision making, and adaptation related to ocean acidification and its impacts.”

SEC. 112. RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.

Section 12407(a) of the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3706(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall continue to carry out research activities on ocean acidification which shall support competitive, merit-based, peer-reviewed proposals for research, observation, and monitoring of ocean acidification and its impacts, including—

“(1) impacts on marine organisms, including species cultured for aquaculture, and marine ecosystems;

“(2) impacts on ocean, coastal, and estuarine biogeochemistry;

“(3) the development of methodologies and technologies to evaluate ocean acidification and its impacts; and

“(4) impacts of multiple stressors on ecosystems exhibiting hypoxia, harmful algal blooms, or sediment delivery, combined with changes in ocean chemistry.”

TITLE II—NAMED STORM EVENT MODEL AND POST-STORM ASSESSMENTS

SEC. 201. NAMED STORM EVENT MODEL AND POST-STORM ASSESSMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE OMNIBUS PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2009.—Section 12312 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3611) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, except that the term shall not apply with respect to a State or territory that has an operational wind and flood loss allocation system.”;

(B) in paragraph (6), by inserting “sustained” before “winds”; and

(C) in paragraph (7), by striking “that threaten any portion of a coastal State” and inserting “for which post-storm assessments are conducted”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “540 days after the date of the enactment of the Consumer Option for an Alternative System to Allocate Losses Act of 2012” and inserting “December 31, 2020”; and

(II) by striking “by regulation”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “every” and inserting “an”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) PUBLIC REVIEW.—The Administrator shall seek input and suggestions from the public before the Named Storm Event Model, or any modification to the Named Storm Event Model, takes effect.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) DATA COLLECTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon identification of a named storm under subparagraph (A), and pursuant to the protocol established under

subsection (c), the Administrator may deploy sensors to enhance the collection of covered data in the areas in coastal States that the Administrator determines are at the highest risk of experiencing geophysical events that would cause indeterminate losses.

“(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—If the Administrator takes action under clause (i), that action may not be construed as indicating that a post-storm assessment will be developed for any coastal State in which that action is taken.

“(C) IDENTIFICATION OF INDETERMINATE LOSSES IN COASTAL STATES.—Not later than 30 days after the first date on which sustained winds of not less than 39 miles per hour are measured in a coastal State during a named storm identified under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Administrator with respect to the existence of any indeterminate losses in that coastal State resulting from that named storm.”;

(iii) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “identification of a named storm under subparagraph (A)” and inserting “confirmation of indeterminate losses identified under subparagraph (C) with respect to a named storm”; and

(II) by striking “assessment for such named storm” and inserting “assessment for each coastal State that suffered such indeterminate losses as a result of the named storm”;

(iv) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “an identification of a named storm is made under subparagraph (A)” and inserting “any indeterminate losses are identified under subparagraph (C)”; and

(II) by striking “for such storm under subparagraph (B)” and inserting “under subparagraph (D) for any coastal State that suffered such indeterminate losses”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) SEPARATE POST-STORM ASSESSMENTS FOR A SINGLE NAMED STORM.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may conduct a separate post-storm assessment for each coastal State in which indeterminate losses are identified under subparagraph (C).

“(ii) TIMELINE.—If the Administrator conducts a separate post-storm assessment under clause (i), the Administrator shall complete the assessment based on the dates of actions that the Administrator takes under subparagraph (D).”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “540 days after the date of the enactment of the Consumer Option for an Alternative System to Allocate Losses Act of 2012” and inserting “December 31, 2020”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, in the discretion of the Administrator,” after “of sensors as may”; and

(C) in paragraph (4)(B), by inserting “and expend” after “receive”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968.—Section 1337 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4057) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, except that the term shall not apply with respect to a State or territory that has an operational wind and flood loss allocation system.”; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by inserting “sustained” after “maximum”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “establish by rule” and inserting “publish for comment in the Federal Register”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting after “Elevation Certificate” the following: “, or other data or information used to determine a property’s current risk of flood, as determined by the Administrator.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(3)(A)(i), by striking “the issuance of the rule establishing the COASTAL Formula” and inserting “publication of the COASTAL Formula in the Federal Register as required by subsection (b)(1)”;

(4) in subsection (d), by striking “section 12312(b)(2)(C)” and inserting “section 12312(b)(2)(E)”;

(5) in subsection (h)—

(A) by inserting “that issues a standard flood insurance policy under the national flood insurance program” after “company”; and

(B) by striking “or the COASTAL Formula” and inserting “, the COASTAL Formula, or any other loss allocation or post-storm assessment arising under the laws or ordinances of any State”;

(6) in subsection (i), by striking “after the date on which the Administrator issues the rule establishing the COASTAL Formula under subsection (b)” and inserting “60 days after publication of the COASTAL Formula in the Federal Register as required by subsection (b)(1)”;

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(k) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a cause of action under this Act.”

TITLE III—WATER PREDICTION AND FORECASTING

SEC. 301. WATER PREDICTION AND FORECASTING.

(a) NATIONAL WATER CENTER.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere shall establish a center—

(i) to serve as the research and operational center of excellence for hydrologic analyses, forecasting, and related decision support services within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Weather Service; and

(ii) to facilitate collaboration across Federal and State departments and agencies, academia, and the private sector on matters relating to water resources.

(B) DESIGNATION.—The center established under subparagraph (A) shall be known as the “National Water Center”.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the National Water Center shall include the following:

(A) Improving understanding of water resources, stakeholder needs regarding water resources, and identifying science and services gaps relating to water resources.

(B) Developing and implementing advanced water resources modeling capabilities.

(C) Facilitating the transition of hydrologic research into operations.

(D) Delivering analyses, forecasts, and inundation information and guidance for all hydrologic events in the United States, including flash flooding, riverine flooding, and water resources outlooks.

(E) In coordination with warning coordination meteorologists, providing decision-support services to inform emergency management and water resources decisions.

(b) NATIONAL INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Weather Service, shall make public an operations and services policy directive for the National Water Center.

(2) CONTENTS.—The directive required by paragraph (1) shall include national instructions to perform the functions of the National Water Center, including the following:

(A) Operational staff responsibilities.

(B) Guidelines for content, format, and provision of hydrologic and inundation products developed by the National Water Center.

(C) Procedures for cooperation and coordination between the National Water Center, the National Weather Service National Centers for Environmental Prediction, National Weather Service River Forecast Centers, and National Weather Service Weather Forecast Offices.

(c) TOTAL WATER PREDICTION.—The Under Secretary, acting through the Director of the Office of Water Prediction of the National Weather Service, shall—

(1) initiate and lead research and development activities to develop operational water resource prediction and related decision support products;

(2) collaborate with, and provide decision support regarding total water prediction to—

(A) the relevant Federal agencies represented on the National Science and Technology Council, Committee on Environment, Natural Resources, and Sustainability and the Subcommittee on Disaster Reduction;

(B) State water resource agencies; and

(C) State and local emergency management agencies; and

(3) in carrying out the responsibilities described in paragraphs (1) and (2), collaboratively develop capabilities necessary for total water predictive capacity, including observations, modeling, data management, supercomputing, social science, and communications.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the activities under this section amounts as follows:

(1) \$44,500,000 for fiscal year 2021.

(2) \$45,000,000 for fiscal year 2022.

(3) \$45,500,000 for fiscal year 2023.

(4) \$46,000,000 for fiscal year 2024.

(e) DERIVATION OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available to carry out this section shall be derived from amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the National Weather Service and the National Ocean Service.

SA 2502. Mr. SULLIVAN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 850, to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans; as follows:

Strike section 3 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. MAKING PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO TRANSPORT INDIVIDUALS TO AND FROM FACILITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 111A(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2); and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “(1)”.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on cost savings, performance, and satisfaction of individuals, with respect to—

(A) the transport by the Secretary of individuals under subsection (a) of section 111A of title 38, United States Code; and

(B) the program the establishment of which was facilitated under subsection (b) of this section.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the effect of emerging health care modalities, including telehealth and VA Video Connect, on—

(A) the transport of individuals described in paragraph (1)(A);

(B) the satisfaction of such individuals with services described in section 111A(a) of title 38, United States Code; and

(C) the program described in paragraph (1)(B).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) TELEHEALTH.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term “telehealth” means the use of electronic information and telecommunications technologies to support and promote long-distance clinical health care, patient and professional health-related education, public health, and health administration.

(ii) TECHNOLOGIES.—For purposes of clause (i), telecommunications technologies include videoconferencing, the internet, streaming media, and terrestrial and wireless communications.

(B) VA VIDEO CONNECT.—The term “VA Video Connect” means the program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to connect veterans with their health care team from anywhere, using encryption to ensure a secure and private session.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 111A(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “veterans’ service organizations” and inserting “veterans service organizations”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. XXX. Mr. President, I have 5 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 BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 2020, at 8:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

NATIONAL LANDSLIDE PREPAREDNESS ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 315, S. 529.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 529) to establish a national program to identify and reduce losses from landslide hazards, to establish a national 3D Elevation Program, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Landslide Preparedness Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) 3D.—*The term “3D” means 3-dimensional.*

(2) 3D ELEVATION DATA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—*The term “3D elevation data” means 3D, high-resolution data obtained using LiDAR, IfSAR, or other methods over the United States (including territories).*

(B) INCLUSIONS.—*The term “3D elevation data” includes terrestrial and bathymetric elevation data.*

(3) 3D ELEVATION PROGRAM.—*The term “3D Elevation Program” means the 3D Elevation Program established under section 5(a).*

(4) IfSAR.—*The term “IfSAR” means interferometric synthetic aperture radar.*

(5) INDIAN TRIBE.—*The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).*

(6) LAHAR.—*The term “lahar” means a large debris flow of mostly volcanic material that is—*

(A) *often fast-moving; and*

(B) *a hazard in watersheds downstream of volcanic peaks.*

(7) LiDAR.—*The term “LiDAR” means light detection and ranging.*

(8) SECRETARY.—*The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey.*

(9) STATE.—*The term “State” means—*

(A) *a State; and*

(B) *the District of Columbia.*

(10) STATE OFFICE.—*The term “State office” means any unit of State government that handles the identification, mapping, assessment, and research of landslide hazards or responding to landslide events, including—*

(A) *a State geological survey office;*

(B) *a State department of emergency response; and*

(C) *a State department of transportation.*

(11) TERRITORY.—*The term “territory” means—*

(A) *the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;*

(B) *Guam;*

(C) *American Samoa;*

(D) *the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;*

(E) *the Federated States of Micronesia;*

(F) *the Republic of the Marshall Islands;*

(G) *the Republic of Palau; and*

(H) *the United States Virgin Islands.*

SEC. 3. NATIONAL LANDSLIDE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—*The Secretary shall establish a program, to be known as the “National Landslide Hazards Reduction Program” (referred to in this section as the “program”)—*

(1) to identify and understand landslide hazards and risks;

(2) to reduce losses from landslides;

(3) to protect communities at risk of landslide hazards; and

(4) to help improve communication and emergency preparedness, including by coordinating with communities and entities responsible for infrastructure that are at risk of landslide hazards.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Landslide Hazards established by subsection (c)(1) (referred to in this section as the “Committee”) and in coordination with existing activities of the United States Geological Survey and other Federal agencies, shall—

(A) identify, map, assess, and research landslide hazards;

(B) respond to landslide events; and

(C) in coordination with State offices, units of local government, territories, and Indian tribes—

(i) establish working groups with State offices, units of local government, territories, and Indian tribes to identify regional and local priorities for researching, identifying, mapping, and assessing landslide hazards; and

(ii) develop and implement landslide hazard guidelines for—

(I) geologists;

(II) geological and geotechnical engineers;

(III) emergency management personnel; and

(IV) land use and other decisionmakers.

(2) NATIONAL STRATEGY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in coordination with the Committee, shall develop and publish a national strategy for landslide hazards, risk reduction, and response in the United States (including territories), which shall include—

(A) goals and priorities for the program;

(B) priorities for data acquisition, research, communications, and risk management on landslides and landslide hazards across relevant Federal agencies; and

(C) a detailed interagency plan, which shall take into consideration national disaster preparedness, response, and recovery frameworks, to carry out the national strategy, including details about the programs, projects, and budgets that will be used to implement the national strategy.

(3) NATIONAL LANDSLIDE HAZARDS DATABASE.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary, in coordination with State offices, units of local government, territories, and Indian tribes, shall develop and maintain a publicly accessible national landslide hazard and risk inventory database to compile, maintain, standardize, and evaluate data regarding—

(A) landslide hazards and risks;

(B) the impact of landslides on—

(i) health and safety;

(ii) the economy and infrastructure; and

(iii) the environment;

(C) landslide hazard stabilization; and

(D) reduction of losses from landslides.

(4) LANDSLIDE HAZARD AND RISK PREPAREDNESS FOR COMMUNITIES.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, and in consultation with State offices, units of local government, territories, and Indian tribes, shall develop and disseminate—

(A) landslide planning and risk reduction guidance, guidelines, maps, tools, and training materials to help inform State, territorial, local, and Tribal governments and decisionmakers with respect to—

(i) the use and implementation of landslide hazard assessments;

(ii) the applied use of the database developed under paragraph (3);

(iii) reducing losses from landslides; and

(iv) resources available for communities working to improve landslide hazard preparedness; and

(B) landslide preparedness curricula and training modules for—

(i) State, territorial, local, and Tribal officials;

(ii) Federal, State, territorial, local, and Tribal emergency managers; and

(iii) the National Guard.

(5) DEBRIS FLOW EARLY WARNING SYSTEM.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall expand the early warning system for debris flow by—

(A) expanding the early warning system for post-wildfire debris flow to include recently burned areas across the western United States;

(B) developing procedures with State, territorial, local, and Tribal governments to monitor stormwater drainage in areas with high debris flow risk; and

(C) identifying high-risk debris flow areas, such as recently burned land and potential lahar hazard areas.

(6) EMERGENCY RESPONSE ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, States offices, units of local government, territories, and Indian tribes, shall establish and support emergency response procedures for the rapid deployment of Federal scientists, equipment, and services to areas impacted by a significant landslide event—

(A) to support emergency response efforts and improve the safety of emergency responders;

(B) to improve data collection; and

(C) to conduct research to advance the understanding of the causes, impacts, and reduction of landslide hazards and risks.

(c) INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON LANDSLIDE HAZARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established a committee, to be known as the “Interagency Coordinating Committee on Landslide Hazards”.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of the following members (or their designees):

(A) The Secretary, who shall serve as Chairperson of the Committee.

(B) The Secretary of Agriculture.

(C) The Secretary of the Army.

(D) The Secretary of Commerce.

(E) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

(F) The Secretary of Transportation.

(G) The Director of the National Science Foundation.

(H) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(I) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(3) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(4) PURPOSE AND DUTIES.—The Committee shall—

(A) advise and oversee the program;

(B) facilitate communication and coordination across Federal agencies in the planning, management, budgeting, and execution of landslide activities; and

(C) support the development and execution of the national strategy under subsection (b)(2), including by—

(i) supporting the development of national goals and priorities for the national strategy;

(ii) articulating Federal agency roles, responsibilities, and resources for carrying out the national strategy; and

(iii) overseeing the implementation of the national strategy.

(d) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee, to be known as the “Advisory Committee on Landslides” (referred to in this subsection as the “Advisory Committee”).

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of not fewer than 11 members—

(A) of whom none may be an individual described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 7342(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) who shall be representatives of—

(i) States, including State geological organizations;

(ii) territories, including territorial geological organizations;

(iii) Indian tribes, including Tribal geological organizations;

(iv) research institutions and institutions of higher education that are qualified—

(I) to provide advice regarding landslide hazard and risk reduction; and

(II) to represent related scientific, architectural, engineering, and planning disciplines;

(v) industry standards development organizations; and

(vi) State, territorial, local, and Tribal emergency management agencies.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall submit to the Committee recommendations for the implementation of the program, including recommendations regarding—

(i) landslide hazard and risk reduction and planning;

(ii) tools for communities;

(iii) research; and

(iv) such other topics as the Advisory Committee determines appropriate.

(B) CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary and the agency heads described in subparagraphs (B) through (I) of subsection (c)(2) shall take into consideration any recommendation of the Advisory Committee submitted under subparagraph (A).

(e) GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COOPERATIVE LANDSLIDE HAZARD MAPPING AND ASSESSMENT PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to appropriations, the Secretary may—

(i) provide grants, on a competitive basis, to State, territorial, local, and Tribal governments to research, map, assess, and collect data on landslide hazards within the jurisdictions of those governments; and

(ii) accept and use funds received from other Federal and non-Federal partners to advance the purposes of the program.

(B) PRIORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consult annually with the Committee, States, units of local government, territories, and Indian tribes to establish priorities for the grant program under this paragraph.

(ii) FUNDING PRIORITIZATION.—In providing grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall give priority to projects—

(I) that will achieve the greatest landslide hazard and risk reduction;

(II) that reflect the goals and priorities of the national strategy established under subsection (b)(2)(A);

(III) not less than 50 percent of the total cost of which is matched by non-Federal sources; and

(IV) that include acquisition of enhanced elevation data consistent with the 3D Elevation Program.

(C) REQUIREMENT.—If the Secretary elects to provide grants under subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall publish on a publicly available website a description of—

(i) the grants; and

(ii) the findings made from those grants.

(2) NATIONAL LANDSLIDE RESEARCH GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To advance the goals and priorities of the national strategy established under subsection (b)(2)(A), subject to appropriations, the Director of the National Science Foundation (referred to in this paragraph as the “Director”) may provide grants to eligible entities for landslide research, including research on—

(i) the causes, mechanisms, triggers, hydrology, and geology of landslides;

(ii) ways to reduce landslide hazards and risks to minimize loss of life and property, including landslide hazard and risk communication, perception, decisionmaking, tools, and technologies; and

(iii) other goals and priorities of the national strategy established under subsection (b)(2)(A).

(B) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—The Director shall determine whether an entity is eligible to receive a grant under this paragraph.

(C) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In providing grants under this paragraph, the Director shall—

(i) ensure that the grants are provided on a competitive basis;

(ii) consider grant applications submitted by eligible entities that have developed the application in partnership with 1 or more State geological surveys; and

(iii) publish on a publicly available website a description of—

(I) the grants; and

(II) the findings made from those grants.

(f) **BIENNIAL REPORT.**—Through calendar year 2030, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a biennial report, including a description of, with respect to the 2-calendar-year period preceding the date of the report—

(1) the goals and accomplishments of the Committee in carrying out the national strategy developed under subsection (b)(2);

(2) the results of the activities of the Committee under this section; and

(3) the extent to which any recommendations of the Advisory Committee under subsection (d)(3)(A) have been implemented.

(g) **SIGNIFICANT EVENTS.**—Not later than 1 year after a significant landslide event in the United States (including territories) occurs, the Secretary shall publish on a publicly available website—

(1) a description of the landslide event and the implications of the event on communities, including life and property;

(2) recommendations on how the identification of the landslide risk could have been improved prior to the event;

(3) a description of the effectiveness of any warning and risk communication, including the dissemination of warnings by State, territorial, local, and Tribal partners in the affected area;

(4) recommendations to improve risk identification, reduction, and communication to landowners and units of local government;

(5) recommendations to improve landslide hazard preparedness and emergency response activities under this section; and

(6) such other findings as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(h) **FUNDING.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$37,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2023, of which—

(1) \$25,000,000 each fiscal year shall be made available to the United States Geological Survey;

(2) \$11,000,000 each fiscal year shall be made available to the National Science Foundation; and

(3) \$1,000,000 each fiscal year shall be made available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

SEC. 4. GROUND SUBSIDENCE.

As the Secretary determines to be appropriate and subject to appropriations, the Secretary, through existing programs, shall advance the identification, mapping, research, and monitoring of subsidence and groundwater resource accounting, particularly in areas affected by drought.

SEC. 5. 3D ELEVATION PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF 3D ELEVATION PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a program, to be known as the “3D Elevation Program”—

(A) to provide 3D elevation data coverage for the United States;

(B) to coordinate and facilitate the collection, dissemination, and use of 3D elevation data among Federal departments and agencies and non-Federal entities;

(C) to produce standard, publicly accessible 3D elevation data products for the United States; and

(D) to promote the collection, dissemination, and use of 3D elevation data among Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments, communities, institutions of higher education, and the private sector through—

(i) cooperative agreements;

(ii) the development and maintenance of spatial data infrastructure to provide quality control and deliver to the public 3D elevation data products;

(iii) in coordination with the 3D Elevation Federal Interagency Coordinating Committee established under subsection (b), States, and industry and standards bodies, the development of standards and guidelines for 3D elevation data acquisition to increase accessibility to 3D elevation data in a standard, easy-to-use format; and

(iv) the identification, assessment, and adoption of emerging technologies to improve the accuracy and efficiency of the 3D Elevation Program.

(2) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the 3D Elevation Program—

(i) to ensure efficiency with respect to related activities of the Department of the Interior and other participating Federal departments and agencies; and

(ii) to meet the needs of Department of the Interior programs, stakeholders, and the public.

(B) **OTHER FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.**—The head of each Federal department and agency involved in the acquisition, production, distribution, or application of 3D elevation data shall—

(i) coordinate with the 3D Elevation Federal Interagency Coordinating Committee established under subsection (b) to acquire additional, enhanced 3D elevation data;

(ii) submit to the Secretary a description of priority areas of interest for 3D elevation data collection for use in providing grants and cooperative agreements under subsection (d);

(iii) implement policies and procedures for data acquisition and sharing that are consistent with standards and guidelines developed under the 3D Elevation Program;

(iv) participate in, and share the results and benefits of, the 3D Elevation Program, in accordance with standards and guidelines developed under the 3D Elevation Program; and

(v) ensure that any 3D elevation data acquired with Federal grant funding—

(I) meets 3D Elevation Program standards; and

(II) is included in the national holdings of those data.

(b) **3D ELEVATION FEDERAL INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall establish an interagency coordinating committee, to be known as the “3D Elevation Federal Interagency Coordinating Committee” (referred to in this subsection as the “Committee”), to better coordinate 3D elevation data management across the Federal Government.

(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Committee shall be composed of the following members (or their designees):

(A) The Secretary, who shall serve as Chairperson of the Committee.

(B) The Secretary of Agriculture.

(C) The Secretary of Commerce.

(D) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

(E) The Director of the National Science Foundation.

(F) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(G) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(H) The head of any other Federal department or agency, at the request of the Secretary.

(3) **COORDINATION.**—The Committee shall coordinate, as appropriate, with the existing activities of—

(A) the 3D Elevation Program Executive Forum;

(B) the Alaska Mapping Executive Committee;

(C) the 3D Elevation Working Group;

(D) the 3D National Elevation Subcommittee; and

(E) State offices.

(4) **MEETINGS.**—The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(5) **DUTIES.**—The Committee shall—

(A) oversee the planning, management, and coordination of the 3D Elevation Program; and

(B) develop, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and update periodically thereafter—

(i) a strategic plan that establishes goals and priorities for activities carried out under the 3D Elevation Program; and

(ii) a detailed management plan to implement the strategic plan.

(c) **SUBCOMMITTEE OF NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish, within the National Geospatial Advisory Committee, a subcommittee (referred to in this subsection as the “Subcommittee”).

(B) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Subcommittee shall—

(i) consist of not fewer than 11 members, of whom none may be a Federal officer or employee; and

(ii) include representatives of—

(I) research and academic institutions;

(II) industry standards development organizations;

(III) units of State and local government; and

(IV) the private sector.

(2) **DUTIES.**—

(A) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Subcommittee shall conduct an assessment of—

(i) trends and developments in—

(I) the collection, dissemination, and use of 3D elevation data; and

(II) science and technology relating to 3D elevation data;

(ii) the effectiveness of the 3D Elevation Program in carrying out the activities described in subsection (a)(1);

(iii) the need to revise or reorganize the 3D Elevation Program; and

(iv) the management, coordination, implementation, and activities of the 3D Elevation Program.

(B) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Subcommittee shall submit to the Secretary and the 3D Elevation Federal Interagency Coordinating Committee established under subsection (b) a report that includes—

(i) the findings of the assessment under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) recommendations of the Subcommittee based on those findings, if any.

(d) **GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may make grants and enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal departments and agencies, units of State, local, or Tribal government, institutions of higher education, nonprofit research institutions, or other organizations to facilitate the improvement of nationwide coverage of 3D elevation data.

(2) **APPLICATIONS.**—To be eligible to receive a grant or enter into a cooperative agreement under this subsection, an entity described in paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(3) *TERMS AND CONDITIONS.*—A grant or cooperative agreement under this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, including making data publically available and interoperable with other Federal datasets.

(e) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2023.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Cantwell amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 2500) was agreed to, as follows

(Purpose: To improve the authorizations of appropriations)

Beginning on page 42, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 43, line 5, and insert the following:

(h) *FUNDING.*—For each of fiscal years 2021 and 2024—

(1) there is authorized out of funds appropriated to the United States Geological Survey, \$25,000,000 to carry out this section;

(2) there is authorized out of funds appropriated to the National Science Foundation, \$11,000,000 to carry out this section; and

(3) there is authorized out of funds appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, \$1,000,000 to carry out this section.

On page 51, strike lines 7 through 9 and insert the following:

(e) *FUNDING.*—For each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2024, there is authorized out of funds appropriated to the Secretary \$20,000,000 to carry out this section.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 529), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

COORDINATED OCEAN OBSERVATIONS AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2019

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 318, S. 914.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 914) to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and to require the establishment of a National Water Center, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee

on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Wicker substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 2501), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill (S. 914), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HIGHLY RURAL VETERAN TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 413, S. 850.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 850) to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment as follows:

S. 850

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Highly Rural Veteran Transportation Program Extension Act".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS TO VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HIGHLY RURAL VETERANS.

Section 307(d) of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended by striking "2020" and inserting "2021".

SEC. 3. MAKING PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO TRANSPORT INDIVIDUALS TO AND FROM FACILITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 111A(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2); and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking "(1)".

SEC. 4. MEDICAL EXAMINATION PROTOCOL FOR VOLUNTEER DRIVERS PARTICIPATING IN PROGRAM OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR VETERANS.

Section 111A(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" before "The Secretary"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Highly Rural Veteran

Transportation Program Extension Act, the Secretary shall develop and establish a national protocol for the administration of medical examinations for volunteer drivers to participate in the program described in paragraph (1).

"(B) In developing the protocol required by subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with such persons as the Secretary determines have an interest in the program described in paragraph (1).

"(C)(i) The Secretary shall implement the protocol by first conducting a one-year pilot program using the protocol.

"(ii) After conducting the pilot program required by clause (i), the Secretary shall assess the pilot program and make such changes to the protocol as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(iii) After making changes to the protocol under clause (ii), the Secretary shall implement the protocol in phases during the course of one year."

SEC. 5. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR VETERANS.

(a) *REPORT REQUIRED.*—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the program the establishment of which was facilitated under section 111A(b) of title 38, United States Code.

(b) *CONTENTS.*—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the program described in subsection (a), including descriptions of the following:

(A) The purpose of the program.

(B) The activities carried out under the program.

(2) An assessment of the sufficiency of the program with respect to the purpose of the program.

(3) An assessment of the cost effectiveness of the program in relation to alternatives.

(4) An assessment of the health benefits for veterans who have participated in the program.

(5) An assessment of the sufficiency of staffing of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs who are responsible for facilitating the maintenance of the program.

(6) An assessment, with respect to the purpose of the program, of the number of vehicles owned by and operating in conjunction with the program.

(7) An assessment of the awareness and usage of the program by veterans and their families.

(8) An assessment of other options for transportation under the program, such as local taxi companies and ridesharing programs such as Uber and Lyft.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Sullivan amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; the committee-reported amendment, as amended, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 2502) was agreed to as follows

(Purpose: To require a report by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the transportation of individuals to and from facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs)

Strike section 3 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. MAKING PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO TRANSPORT INDIVIDUALS TO AND FROM FACILITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 111A(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by striking paragraph (2); and
 (2) in paragraph (1), by striking “(1)”.

REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on cost savings, performance, and satisfaction of individuals, with respect to—

(A) the transport by the Secretary of individuals under subsection (a) of section 111A of title 38, United States Code; and

(B) the program the establishment of which was facilitated under subsection (b) of such section.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the effect of emerging health care modalities, including telehealth and VA Video Connect, on—

(A) the transport of individuals described in paragraph (1)(A);

(B) the satisfaction of such individuals with services described in section 111A(a) of title 38, United States Code; and

(C) the program described in paragraph (1)(B).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) TELEHEALTH.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term “telehealth” means the use of electronic information and telecommunications technologies to support and promote long-distance clinical health care, patient and professional health-related education, public health, and health administration.

(ii) TECHNOLOGIES.—For purposes of clause (i), telecommunications technologies include videoconferencing, the internet, streaming media, and terrestrial and wireless communications.

(B) VA VIDEO CONNECT.—The term “VA Video Connect” means the program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to connect veterans with their health care team from anywhere, using encryption to ensure a secure and private session.

(C) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 111A(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “veterans’ service organizations” and inserting “veterans service organizations”.

The committee-reported amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 850), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 850

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Highly Rural Veteran Transportation Program Extension Act”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS TO VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HIGHLY RURAL VETERANS.

Section 307(d) of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–163; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended by striking “2020” and inserting “2021”.

SEC. 3. MAKING PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO TRANSPORT INDIVIDUALS TO AND FROM FACILITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 111A(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by striking paragraph (2); and
 (2) in paragraph (1), by striking “(1)”.

REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on cost savings, performance, and satisfaction of individuals, with respect to—

(A) the transport by the Secretary of individuals under subsection (a) of section 111A of title 38, United States Code; and

(B) the program the establishment of which was facilitated under subsection (b) of such section.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the effect of emerging health care modalities, including telehealth and VA Video Connect, on—

(A) the transport of individuals described in paragraph (1)(A);

(B) the satisfaction of such individuals with services described in section 111A(a) of title 38, United States Code; and

(C) the program described in paragraph (1)(B).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) TELEHEALTH.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term “telehealth” means the use of electronic information and telecommunications technologies to support and promote long-distance clinical health care, patient and professional health-related education, public health, and health administration.

(ii) TECHNOLOGIES.—For purposes of clause (i), telecommunications technologies include videoconferencing, the internet, streaming media, and terrestrial and wireless communications.

(B) VA VIDEO CONNECT.—The term “VA Video Connect” means the program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to connect veterans with their health care team from anywhere, using encryption to ensure a secure and private session.

(C) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 111A(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “veterans’ service organizations” and inserting “veterans service organizations”.

SEC. 4. MEDICAL EXAMINATION PROTOCOL FOR VOLUNTEER DRIVERS PARTICIPATING IN PROGRAM OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR VETERANS.

Section 111A(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2)(A) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Highly Rural Veteran Transportation Program Extension Act, the Secretary shall develop and establish a national protocol for the administration of medical examinations for volunteer drivers to participate in the program described in paragraph (1).

“(B) In developing the protocol required by subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with such persons as the Secretary determines have an interest in the program described in paragraph (1).

“(C)(i) The Secretary shall implement the protocol by first conducting a one-year pilot program using the protocol.

“(ii) After conducting the pilot program required by clause (i), the Secretary shall assess the pilot program and make such changes to the protocol as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(iii) After making changes to the protocol under clause (ii), the Secretary shall implement the protocol in phases during the course of one year.”.

SEC. 5. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR VETERANS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this

Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the program the establishment of which was facilitated under section 111A(b) of title 38, United States Code.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the program described in subsection (a), including descriptions of the following:

(A) The purpose of the program.

(B) The activities carried out under the program.

(2) An assessment of the sufficiency of the program with respect to the purpose of the program.

(3) An assessment of the cost effectiveness of the program in relation to alternatives.

(4) An assessment of the health benefits for veterans who have participated in the program.

(5) An assessment of the sufficiency of staffing of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs who are responsible for facilitating the maintenance of the program.

(6) An assessment, with respect to the purpose of the program, of the number of vehicles owned by and operating in conjunction with the program.

(7) An assessment of the awareness and usage of the program by veterans and their families.

(8) An assessment of other options for transportation under the program, such as local taxi companies and ridesharing programs such as Uber and Lyft.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY REFORM ACT OF 2019

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 423, S. 2336.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2336) to improve the management of information technology projects and investments of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent 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.

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

The bill (S. 2336) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2336

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Veterans Affairs Information Technology Reform Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. MANAGEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS.

(a) UPDATE OF REVIEW PROCESS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DASHBOARD CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER RATINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall update the review process for information technology projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs to ensure that active risks are factored into the Information Technology Dashboard Chief Information Officer ratings.

(2) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—Not later than one year after the date on which the Secretary completes updating the review process under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a review such process.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON PROJECT BUDGET DISCREPANCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each fiscal year, not later than 120 days after the end of the previous fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on covered information technology projects of the Department with respect to which the amounts that were obligated and the amounts expended by the Department in that fiscal year were, in aggregate, 10 percent or more greater or less than the amount budgeted for the project in that fiscal year.

(2) COVERED INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS.—For purposes of this subsection, a covered information technology project of the Department is an information technology project of the Department for which the Secretary estimates the Department will expend or obligate \$25,000,000 or more for development and sustainment over a three-year lifecycle.

(3) MITIGATION PLANS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, for each project described in the report, a plan to rectify the budget discrepancy and improve the accuracy of the budget formulation process of the Department.

SEC. 3. PLAN FOR EXPENDITURES RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS AND INVESTMENTS.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a plan for expenditures of the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to large information technology projects and investments.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Identification of each information technology project and investment planned by the Secretary for which the Secretary estimates the Department will expend or obligate \$25,000,000 or more for development and sustainment over a three-year lifecycle.

(B) For each such project and investment, a description of—

(i) the functional and performance capabilities to be delivered and the mission benefits to be realized;

(ii) the estimated lifecycle cost, including estimates for development as well as maintenance and operations; and

(iii) key milestones to be met.

(C) Demonstration that each project and investment is—

(i) consistent with the Information Technology Modernization Plan of the Department, or successor plan;

(ii) being managed in accordance with applicable lifecycle management policies and guidance; and

(iii) subject to applicable planning and investment control requirements of the Department.

(D) A statement as to whether the plan has been reviewed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(b) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that whenever the budget justification materials are submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Veterans Affairs budget for a fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President for such fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code), such budget justification materials include a specific accounting, including life cycle costs, of all funds requested for the information technology programs of the Department.

SEC. 5. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS COMPLIANCE WITH OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the Department of Veterans Affairs complies with all applicable requirements of the Data Center Optimization Initiative (DCOI) of the Office of Management and Budget, including by—

(1) fully identifying the data center inventory of the Department; and

(2) meeting any targets assigned by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to such initiative regarding data center closures, optimization savings, and optimization metrics.

(b) PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a plan to fully comply with the requirements described in subsection (a).

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2020, and in March of each year thereafter until the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines that the Department is in full compliance with the requirements of the initiative referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of the Secretary in carrying out the plan submitted under subsection (b).

SEC. 6. ANNUAL LIST OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS.

(a) ANNUAL LIST.—Not less frequently than once each year, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a comprehensive, prioritized list of all information technology projects being funded by the Department of Veterans Affairs, disaggregated by business line or portfolio division.

(b) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 7. ASSESSMENT OF SUITABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS FOR MIGRATION TO CLOUD COMPUTING SERVICE.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, acting through the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Veterans Affairs, shall complete an assessment, in accordance with guidance from the Office of Management and Budget, of all information technology investments of the Department of Veterans Affairs to determine the suitability of the investments for migration to a cloud computing service.

(b) MECHANISM TO TRACK SAVINGS.—The Secretary shall create a consistent and repeatable mechanism to track savings and cost avoidances from—

(1) migration of information technology investments to cloud computing services; and

(2) deployment of cloud computing services.

(c) REPORT ON SPENDING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Chief, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on spending by the Department on information technology investments, disaggregated by information technology investment.

(d) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO ROLE OF CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the information technology management policies of the Department of Veterans Affairs address the role of the Chief Information Officer of the Department with respect to the following key responsibilities:

(1) Information technology strategic planning.

(2) Information technology workforce.

(3) Information technology planning, programming, and budgeting.

(4) Information technology investment management.

(5) Innovations and emerging technologies.

SEC. 9. CONTINUOUS MONITORING STRATEGY TO IMPROVE INFORMATION SECURITY PROGRAMS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

In order to improve information security programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall develop a continuous monitoring strategy that addresses the following:

(1) Organization-defined metrics.

(2) Frequency of monitoring metrics.

(3) Ongoing status monitoring of metrics.

(4) Reporting of security status.

SEC. 10. REVISION OF PROCESSES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY RELATING TO RISK MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, acting through the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Veterans Affairs, shall revise the processes of the Office of Information and Technology of the Department relating to risk management to include the following:

(1) Determining costs and benefits of implementing the risk mitigation plan for each risk.

(2) Collecting performance measures on risk handling activities.

(b) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a review of the processes revised pursuant to subsection (a).

NATIONAL BLUEBERRY MONTH

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 656.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 656) recognizing the importance of the blueberry industry to the United States and designating July 2020 as "National Blueberry Month".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 656) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 22, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

GOLD STAR FAMILIES REMEMBRANCE WEEK

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 664, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 664) designating the week of September 20 through September 26, 2020, as "Gold Star Families Remembrance Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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. 664) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2020

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, August 3; further that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Menezes nomination; finally, that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Menezes nomination occur at 5:30 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2020, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, 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 5:42 p.m., adjourned until Monday, August 3, 2020, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 30, 2020:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DEREK KAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DOUGLAS S. LOWREY
COL. CURTIS D. TAYLOR
COL. JAMES P. WORK

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. REBECCA R. VERNON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. RANDALL E. KITCHENS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN B. MORRISON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LAURA A. POTTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. LEVON E. CUMPTON
COL. GREGORY C. KNIGHT
COL. KODJO S. KNOX-LIMBACKER
COL. EDWARDS S. LITTLE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN

THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. MARTIN M. CLAY, JR.
COL. DAVID S. GAYLE
COL. ERIC J. RILEY
COL. JAMES P. SCHEFFLER
COL. MICHAEL J. TURLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. FARIN D. SCHWARTZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. GREGORY P. CHANEY
BRIG. GEN. JILL K. PARIS
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY P. MARLETTE
BRIG. GEN. JOSE J. REYES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PAUL T. CALVERT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JEFFREY A. KRUSE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. SCOTT D. BERRIER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN C. ANDONIE
BRIG. GEN. CHARLES K. ARIS
BRIG. GEN. MARTI J. BISSELL
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT D. BURKE
BRIG. GEN. EDWARD J. CHRYSTAL, JR.
BRIG. GEN. DAMIAN T. DONAHOE
BRIG. GEN. RALPH F. HEDENBERG
BRIG. GEN. JOHN E. HOEFERT
BRIG. GEN. RUSSELL D. JOHNSON
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY A. JONES
BRIG. GEN. JOHN T. KELLY
BRIG. GEN. ERIC K. LITTLE
BRIG. GEN. JERRY H. MARTIN
BRIG. GEN. JOANE K. MATHEWS
BRIG. GEN. MARK D. MCCORMACK
BRIG. GEN. REGINALD G. A. NEAL
BRIG. GEN. SHAWN M. O'BRIEN
BRIG. GEN. DAVID F. O'DONAHUE
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN B. OWENS
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN M. RADULSKI
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. RHODES
BRIG. GEN. FRANK M. RICE
BRIG. GEN. JAMES W. RING
BRIG. GEN. MICHELLE M. ROSE
BRIG. GEN. JOHN W. RUEGER
BRIG. GEN. RANDALL V. SIMMONS, JR.
BRIG. GEN. CARLTON G. SMITH
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN E. STIVERS
BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY N. THOMBLESON
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY P. VAN
BRIG. GEN. CLINT E. WALKER
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL D. WICKMAN
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM L. ZANA

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TRENT R. DEMOSS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. TONY D. BAUERNFELD

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN

THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. ANDREW W. BATTEN
COL. JOHN W. BOZICEVIC
COL. LONNIE J. BRANUM, JR.
COL. ROBERT H. BUMGARDNER
COL. TOBIN R. CLIFTON
COL. TIMOTHY A. COAKLEY
COL. BRETT P. CONAWAY
COL. CHRISTOPHER R. CRONIN
COL. CHARLENE C. DALTO
COL. DANIEL A. DEGELOW
COL. WAYNE W. DON
COL. RODRIGO R. GONZALEZ III
COL. DAVID L. HALL
COL. JEFFREY S. HEASLEY
COL. MURRAY E. HOLT II
COL. LISA J. HOU
COL. TODD H. HUBBARD
COL. MICHAEL J. HUNT
COL. DAVID L. KAUFFMAN
COL. KEVIN R. KICK
COL. SEAN A. KLAHN
COL. ELMON R. KRUPNIK
COL. NATHAN F. LORD
COL. JOHN P. MAIER
COL. ERIC D. MAXON
COL. LAURA A. MCHUGH
COL. ERIN K. MCMAHON
COL. PAUL L. MINOR
COL. PETER V. MONDELLI
COL. THOMAS E. MOORE II
COL. CHARLES W. MORRISON
COL. MICHAELLE M. MUNGER
COL. RONALD M. NEELY
COL. JOHN C. NIPP
COL. LANCE A. OKAMURA
COL. JUSTIN W. OSBERG
COL. JAMES M. PABIS
COL. ROBERT F. PAOLETTI
COL. PATRICK T. PARDY
COL. KENT M. PORTER
COL. DAVID K. PRITCHETT
COL. DANIEL L. PULVERMACHER
COL. JOSEPH D. REALE
COL. RYAN J. ROBINSON
COL. BREN D. ROGERS
COL. RICARDO R. ROIG
COL. DANA P. SANDERS-UDO
COL. SHAWN R. SATTERFIELD
COL. WILLIAM P. SCOTT, JR.
COL. ISABEL R. SMITH
COL. MONIE R. ULIS
COL. JOHN M. WALLACE
COL. MARK B. YOUNG

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LEIGH G. JOHNSON, TO BE COLONEL.
AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHELSEA L. BARTOE AND ENDING WITH DANIEL J. WATSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2020.
AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF KELLY C. MARTIN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.
AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LANCE M. GOWER, TO BE MAJOR.
AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JENNIFER M. KOLLMAR, TO BE MAJOR.
AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF PAMELA L. BLUEFORD, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.
AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF SUZANNE K. ROMEO, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF NATHANIEL S. SANDERS, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH IVAN ARREGUIN AND ENDING WITH CHEUN S. YOO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATION OF JAMES C. BIRK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF D013487, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF JEREMY J. MANDIA, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH YOUSEF H. ABUHAKMEH AND ENDING WITH DAVID B. ZUSIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANTE L. AMELOTI AND ENDING WITH LARRY L. ZHANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATION OF MARK E. PATTON, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRIS B. WINTER, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF GREGORIO AYALA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VICTOR E. BEITELMAN AND ENDING WITH CHARLES F. GWYNN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATION OF BRENNAN A. BYLSMA, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF DERRICK A. DEJON, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF BRADLEY C. HANNON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTEN L. HOLCOMBE, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF IRWIN JOHNSON, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF BRIAN J. MAWYER, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF SHAWN M. PIERCE, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF ERICKA M. ROSTRAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS D. HEBBLETHWAITE, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF STEVE L. MARTINELLI, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF PETER H. CHAPMAN, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF HEIDI B. DEMAREST, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF SORAYA GODDARD, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID A. A. AWANDA, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF ANDREW S. LOHRENZ, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN J. ACKERSON AND ENDING WITH D015260, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 1, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JI E. AHN AND ENDING WITH G010539, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 1, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MELINDA J. ACUNA AND ENDING WITH D011138, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 1, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TALON G. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH D014945, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 1, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARIECLAUDE C. BETENCOURT AND ENDING WITH ROBERT S. VAIDYA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUFFIN BROWN III AND ENDING WITH JOHN R. ZILLHARDT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY N. AAMLAND AND ENDING WITH DONALD F. MCARTHUR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATION OF JULIE H. FORMBY, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EVAN HART AND ENDING WITH EDWARD M. WISE, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON J. CARPENTER AND ENDING WITH SHANE D. VANIA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER M. DOUTHWAITE AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY L. YONKE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATION OF DANIELLE M. TACK, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TERRY L. CLARK, JR. AND ENDING WITH BRYAN V. STEVENS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAURA C. FAHRENBRUCK AND ENDING WITH ISMAEL RODRIGUEZ, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES C. BOGGS AND ENDING WITH KARL G. WAGNER III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY J. BELUSCAK II AND ENDING WITH JASON J. POTTS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM C. COMSTOCK AND ENDING WITH KELLY L. JOHNSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALEXANDER L. AILER AND ENDING WITH KARLENE M. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LIDILIA M. AMADORGARCIA AND ENDING WITH JESSICA E. W. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALEXANDRIA A. E. ARGUE AND ENDING WITH AIDAN K. WOLFE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON C. S. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH D015630, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GARY W. BROWN AND ENDING WITH KATHLEEN E. GENEST, WHICH NOMI-

NATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 21, 2020.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF JUSTIN W. JENNINGS, TO BE COMMANDER.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MEHDI A. AKACEM AND ENDING WITH JAMES G. ZOULIAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY K. ALBAUGH AND ENDING WITH EDWARD A. WALTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MELANIE EVANGELISTA AND ENDING WITH SCOTT T. OZAKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLOTTE E. CLUVERIUS AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. VINEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOE K. BLAIR II AND ENDING WITH BRENDA K. SHEPHERD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATION OF GUSTAVO AGUILAR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.
NAVY NOMINATION OF RICHARD L. EGGERS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.
NAVY NOMINATION OF RICHARD H. SCHRECKENGAUST, TO BE CAPTAIN.
NAVY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL V. GOMES, TO BE CAPTAIN.
NAVY NOMINATION OF DAVID A. SCHWIND, TO BE COMMANDER.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN FRANCO AND ENDING WITH MARK A. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN A. EVANS AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER S. KOPRIVEC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK A. BELLAR AND ENDING WITH PRATIK RAY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PERRY R. BARKER AND ENDING WITH DAVID C. ROBINSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AMADA Y. AVALOS AND ENDING WITH BILLY F. HALL, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 17, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH URIES S. ANDERSON, JR. AND ENDING WITH RILEY E. SWINNEY, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN R. BELCHER AND ENDING WITH SHAYNE J. SCHUMACHER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JERRY N. BELMONTE AND ENDING WITH RICHARD P. ZABAWA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL K. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH JERRY W. WYRICK II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTIAN G. ACORD AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY W. WHITSETT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AARON N. AARON AND ENDING WITH JASON M. WITTRICK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN F. BRESHEARS AND ENDING WITH ROBERT D. T. WENDT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL M. BRYAN AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL A. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARLO K. ABRAHAMSON AND ENDING WITH TIFFANI B. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES C. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH JASON R. STALEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.
NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL J. BELLINGHAUSEN AND ENDING WITH ERIC R. ZILBERMAN,

WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBECCA K. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH MARCELA C. ZELAYA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GINA M. D. BECKER AND ENDING WITH ANNE L. ZACK, WHICH NOMINA-

TIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH F. ABRUTZ III AND ENDING WITH KEITH S. ZEUNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHELLEY E. BRANCH AND ENDING WITH TROY L. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-

PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2020.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RUTH E. COOK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRENT J. TILSETH, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

SPACE FORCE

SPACE FORCE NOMINATION OF MICHAEL S. HOPKINS, TO BE COLONEL.