



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2020

No. 137

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 4, 2020, at 11 a.m.

Senate

MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2020

The Senate met at 3 p.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.

Our Father, as we think of those so desperately in need of legislative action, give our lawmakers the wisdom and courage needed for these challenging times. Use them to empower all Americans, particularly those on life's margins.

Lord, help our Senators today to discern Your voice as they seek Your will in all they do. Give them the ability to differentiate Your guidance from all others, permitting You to lead them to Your desired destination. Speak to them through Your word. Guide them with Your Spirit, and sustain them with Your might.

We pray in Your great 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 (Mr. HAWLEY). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

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

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, everybody now in the Senate remembers Senator Hatch. I want to tell you how he is still on the job, reminding Americans of our traditions.

Recently, my friend from Utah, former Senator Orrin Hatch, wrote about American academia and our so-called cancel culture. I encourage all Americans to read his essay that was published in the Wall Street Journal. Senator Hatch calls for a "renewed commitment to intellectual diversity" and for a "radical overhaul of campus culture."

I agree with Senator Hatch.

Our institutions of higher learning need to wake up and welcome the open exchange of ideas in the classrooms and across campuses, and if that isn't what universities and colleges are for, I don't know what they are for. Silencing or shaming students from sharing divergent views is antithetical to the American way.

Our next generation of leaders deserves better. As colleges begin the school year, they should focus on keeping their students safe from the virus, but—and a big "but"—they shouldn't worry one bit about keeping students safe from the free exchange of ideas or prevent professors from teaching different schools of thought. The herd mentality limits intellectual curiosity, and that is bad for freedom, particularly academic freedom.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

THE NAVY-MARINES TRAGEDY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate mourns the tragedy that we now know took place Thursday, off the coast of Southern California.

According to official reports, nine American servicemembers—eight marines and one sailor—died during a training exercise. These young servicemembers were all between the ages of 19 and 23. It is absolutely heartbreaking. The units involved are among our most unique and specialized amphibious forces. Their training is what allows them to deploy at a moment's notice, under the harshest conditions, in the most remote and unsupported locations.

As the search for survivors turned into a recovery mission, the Nation was reminded that even what our men and women in uniform may consider to be routine still involves serious risk and personal sacrifice.

I extend the Senate's sympathies to the families of those lost and our gratitude to the Marine Corps, Navy, and Coast Guard personnel who are searching to bring their comrades home.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, this week,

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4653

officials from the intelligence community, the FBI, and the Department of Homeland Security will brief us on foreign efforts to influence our politics and elections and how the administration is defending us. Every one of our colleagues should attend one of these sessions.

Sharing sensitive threat information with Congress is just one of the ways this administration has outperformed its predecessor. The intelligence community kept Congress much more closely informed about these threats in 2018 and now in 2020 than it did in the runup to 2016. I am sure these briefings will contain details that might seem ripe for cherry-picking and partisan leaks from both sides, but it is essential that Congress remain a place where the word “classified” actually means something. Leaking intelligence jeopardizes sources and methods.

If we learned anything from studying Russian interference in 2016, it is that our adversaries’ ultimate objective is to leave America more divided and less confident in our institutions. Members of Congress must take special care not to do Putin’s work for him.

Foreign adversaries have long sought to interfere in our politics and elections. That didn’t start in 2016, and it will not end in 2020, but this administration has put us in a far, far better position than in 2016. There is, simply, no comparison. The intelligence community is better aware of the threat. Government agencies are more transparent with Congress, the State and local jurisdictions that actually run elections, the private sector, and the public.

In 2016, the Obama-Biden administration had to lean on congressional leadership to act as a bridge to the States because the States so distrusted their Department of Homeland Security. Over the last 4 years, this administration’s DHS has develop its own deep relationship with State officials. In 2016, only 14 State or local jurisdictions had received high-tech Albert sensors to alert them to cyber intrusions. They are deployed in all 50 States today. There were 14 States that had them in 2016, and every State has them today. It was this administration that stood up the new Elections Infrastructure Information Sharing and Analysis Center, with participation from more than 2,600 local jurisdictions and counting.

This administration has imposed real, hard costs on election interference and Russia’s other misdeeds: shuttering the Kremlin’s consulates in San Francisco and Seattle; kicking out intelligence officers; sanctioning oligarchs; helping European partners defend their own elections against Russia; and sending weapons to Ukraine and Georgia, which the Obama-Biden administration did not supply.

This administration has also confronted China for what the State Department described as “massive espionage and influence operations,” including closing Beijing’s consulate in Houston.

As the Democratic vice chairman on the Senate Intelligence Committee stated in 2016, “We were caught flat-footed.” Not anymore. Congress has provided more than \$800 million for States and localities to shore up election security and has passed a number of targeted new laws. Since foreign political interference is so often aimed at private sector platforms, like social media sites, we have encouraged those businesses to step up vigilance as well.

Through all of this, we have also carefully avoided things that look like quick fixes but which would undermine our own institutions. In the United States of America, it is the States and localities, not the Federal Government, that run elections—period. Our lack of a one-size-fits-all national system isn’t just constitutionally appropriate; it also acts as a further safeguard. We lack a single point of failure.

So, in closing, I urge all of our colleagues to attend these important briefings with an eye toward our real adversaries—not our fellow Americans but the foreign agents who love to see us at one another’s throats.

Back during the impeachment trial, a leading House Democrat asserted that, if President Trump were to win reelection, the people’s vote would be presumptively invalid.

Just a few days ago, it was reported that a leading Democratic strategist who was war-gaming this election decided to experiment with what would happen if Vice President Biden were to lose the election but were to, simply, fail to concede.

Once again, this kind of recklessness achieves our adversaries’ missions for them. So I urge my colleagues to listen to the civil servants who are defending our democracy. Let’s stay united, focus on the real dangers posed by foreign intelligence, and resist the urge to politicize these vital subjects.

HEALS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, last week, the Senate Democratic leader brought an end to the additional Federal benefit for unemployed workers. The Republicans tried multiple times to extend the money, including at the same dollar level that our colleague himself said he wanted, but the Democratic leader blocked it all.

This is the dynamic on the Democratic side that killed the subject of police reform back in June, and it has now jeopardized more coronavirus relief as well. The Democratic leaders insist publicly that they want an outcome, but they work alone, behind closed doors, to ensure a bipartisan agreement is, actually, not reached.

We are about a week into the Speaker’s and the Democratic leader’s discussions with the administration—a week into the Democratic leadership’s cutting out all of their Members—all of them—cutting out all of their committees, and saying that only they can participate.

So how is it going?

Well, the Democratic leader is still refusing to let struggling Americans get another dime unless he gets a massive tax cut for the wealthy people in blue States that has nothing to do with the coronavirus. I am not kidding. This is his position. There is nothing for schools, nothing for kids, nothing for the PPP, nothing for the healthcare fight. Nobody gets a dime unless the Democratic leader gets a massive tax cut for the rich people in New York and California. That is what he is saying.

The Speaker of the House and the Democratic leader are continuing to say “our way or the highway” with the massive wish list for leftwing lobbyists they slapped together a few weeks ago and called a coronavirus bill—stimulus checks for illegal immigrants, diversity studies for the legal pot industry, and on and on.

When they put out this proposal, even the media and their fellow Democrats pronounced this thing dead on arrival.

Here was one report: “Neither this bill nor anything resembling it will ever become law—it’s a Democratic wish list filled up with all the party’s favored policies.”

Remember how Speaker PELOSI’s own Members felt about this absurd proposal: “Privately, several House Democrats concede their latest bill feels like little more than an effort to appease the most liberal members of the caucus.”

Even Democrats knew Speaker PELOSI’s bill was unserious.

But now, with the additional unemployment benefit disappearing, with families still struggling, they are going back to this unserious position and refusing to budge.

I can’t imagine this is how Democratic colleagues really all want this to play out.

In March, we built the CARES Act by Republicans and Democrats working together at the committee level. This time, again, Republicans introduced a serious proposal written by our own chairmen and our own Members. But this time, the Democratic leader has cut Senate Democrats out entirely. He has forbidden their committees from even talking to Republicans. He is digging in on a House messaging bill, written with no input from his own Members, that even House Democrats themselves called absurd.

These are not the tactics that would build a bipartisan result. These are not the tactics that will get more cash in Americans’ pockets, more help to the unemployed, more assistance for schools to reopen.

It is time for the Democratic leadership to get serious about making a law—making a law—for the American people.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic Leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I just heard the Republican leader speak out on the floor. Leader MCCONNELL is busy giving partisan speeches while for the last 2½ hours Speaker PELOSI, myself, Secretary of Treasury Mnuchin, and Chief of Staff Meadows were sitting in a room working hard, trying to narrow our differences and come to an agreement. We all want to come to an agreement. We know the gravity of the situation demands it. We will continue to work and work at it.

We had a productive meeting. We narrowed some differences. Frankly, there are many that remain, but we must not give up. We must not resort to stark partisanship. We must come together and find a solution.

If I had to characterize the major difference between our side and the Republican side, we believe the gravity of the situation—the economic problems, the health problems—demands a bold, strong, vigorous solution by the Federal Government. We believe we must meet those needs. And it will cost money, but mark my words—if we spend less money now, it will cost us more money later.

We hear from our schools. They very much want to reopen. We hear from the parents of children. They very much want their kids to go back to school, but they want to do it safely. It costs a lot of dollars to make a school safe in this COVID crisis—not only the money for masks and PPE, but you can't sit two kids next to each other on a bus, so there have to be many more bus routes. Because some of the learning will be distant, you need hotspots, and a lot of the kids don't have them in their homes. You may need new ventilating systems because COVID demands it for a healthy classroom. You may need to convert gymnasiums and cafeterias into new classrooms. Teachers may have to teach longer, and we may even

need more teachers. These are very important things we need to do to open schools safely, but they demand more dollars. As we sat in a room today, we discussed our views as to how many dollars are needed.

The same thing with food safety—we Democrats believe that during this crisis, children and adults should not go hungry, and we proposed money to ensure that there are SNAP benefit increases to help people to feed themselves, that there is enough money to feed the kids who used to get school breakfasts and lunches, and that there is enough money at food banks and other places so they can feed their families. That costs money. The Senate Republican proposal here proposed a tax break for a three-martini lunch and a \$20 billion slush fund for big agribusiness but no money for these kids who need to be fed. That is a significant difference. There are many. There are many.

We Democrats believe strongly that we have to have free and fair elections and that the mail must be delivered in a timely way because so many more people are going to vote by mail. So many polling places need to be set up because, with COVID, you can't be close together.

There is a long list of things that are needed. The good news is, our Republican colleagues agree with a few of them, but some they don't agree with, and we are discussing why we think they need them, and they will counter with us in the room—Mnuchin and Meadows. But the discussion is necessary, the discussion is productive, and we will continue it.

Again, the anomaly of the Republican leader making a partisan speech on the floor while we—Speaker PELOSI, myself, Mnuchin, and Meadows—are trying to negotiate and move forward is really a contrast that I think most people see.

So let's keep moving forward. There is a real crisis here. There are people who are unemployed, and they don't deserve a pay cut as they go forward. There are small businesses that need help desperately. There are schools that have to open. There are State and local governments that must have funding. This is not an abstract concept; these are firefighters, our teachers, our healthcare workers, our bus-drivers and sanitation men and women. If the State and local governments don't get money, they are going to be laid off, and services will be much worse.

Again, we have a wide disparity on what kind of dollars and how to deal with treatment. It is our belief that this administration's program on treatment has been a failure, that we don't have enough treatment, and that we have to redouble our efforts to put more money into treatment.

These discussions are continuing because we hope we can reach an agreement. We will keep at it and at it and at it because the Nation demands a so-

lution—a bold, comprehensive solution that will slay this awful virus and its consequences once and for all.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF EL PASO SHOOTING

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, 1 year ago, a gunman stormed into an El Paso Walmart and opened fire. There were 46 people shot; 23, tragically, died; and the devastation in this tight-knit community was beyond imagination. The heartbreak and confusion quickly turned to rage when we learned that this out-of-town shooter was a white supremacist whose crime could only be described as domestic terrorism.

As my good friend El Paso Mayor Dee Margo has said many times over the last year, we will not let this evil define us. He wrote in an op-ed this weekend: "El Paso will not be known for tragedy but for our strength and grace in the midst of tragedy."

That strength comes to mind when I reflect on this terrible anniversary. When I visited El Paso the day after the shooting, I saw the makeshift memorial that was created to honor those who died. On that first day, the collection of photos, flowers, and mementos was relatively small—maybe just a few feet wide—but by the time I came back 3 days later, it had grown to over half a mile. This massive memorial, the long line of folks waiting to donate blood, the generous donations made to support the victims and their families, these were the real reminders of the power and resilience of the El Paso community.

As we remember this anniversary amidst a pandemic, there will not be groups of strangers hugging, crying, or holding hands like I witnessed in the days following the shooting. Instead, we will have socially distanced memorials, like the vigil held yesterday, that will allow El Pasoans once again to prove that hate will not win.

Together, we will remember the 23 lives which were lost 1 year ago, as well as those who were wounded, and we stand in solidarity with El Paso, a border community that has looked hate in the eye and unequivocally chosen strength, grace, and love for one another.

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, with August here and the start of school just around the corner, school districts, colleges, and universities in Texas and Iowa and everywhere else are in the process of making very difficult decisions about how to begin the school year. The teachers, the professors, the faculty, and the administration of these schools

are trying to figure the best way to keep their students safe but, at the same time, provide a quality education for all their students.

As we have seen, there is no one-size-fits-all to the coronavirus when it comes to public health. Our Nation is very diversified, with some highly concentrated populations with multigenerational families and an international travel hub, like New York City, and more rural areas where we, fortunately, have not seen the same sort of impact that we have in some of these concentrated areas.

So, in a country as big and diverse as ours, there has been no one-size-fits-all handbook or rubberstamp response. With COVID-19 surging in some parts of my State and declining in others, decisions, I think, should continue to be made flexibly, which means they should be made locally. Each school district or college knows their challenges, their needs, their capability, and the risks better than anyone else from the outside—certainly from Washington, DC—and they should be the ones, at the local level, to make the decisions how best to safely proceed.

Whether the school year kicks off with in-person, online, or some combination of the two, one thing that has become abundantly clear is that additional Federal support is needed so these schools can safely reopen with the proper protections in place. Congress has already provided \$30 billion in emergency relief for education, including more than \$2.6 billion for Texas alone, which has helped our school districts, colleges, and universities prepare for the start of the new year while filling some holes left by gaps in tuition that has not been collected because students have not been studying in person.

Now, this funding can be used to support things like cleaning services and equipment to protect students and staff returning to the classroom. It could be used for laptops or hot spots for virtual learning.

What we really need is a restoration of confidence that people can continue to get on with their lives, as we all have learned to do, by socially distancing, masking, handwashing, and staying home if you are sick. That is what each of us can do as individual Americans, and that is what students can do in their classroom, as deemed appropriate by local authorities and parents.

Well, we had a strong start in the response to the coronavirus with the legislation that we passed, the repeated bills we passed on a bipartisan basis, virtually unanimously, but now is not the time to take our foot off the gas. The Senate must move quickly to pass additional relief, not only for our students and teachers but for the workers and the industries hit hardest by this pandemic.

Think about our healthcare heroes. These were the truly essential workers who didn't have the choice to work re-

motely; they had to be on the frontline treating the people with the virus.

We have unemployed workers—people who, through no fault of their own, continue to not earn a paycheck—and small businesses that are struggling. Maybe they had a PPP loan and grant but now have continued to see their businesses harmed by lack of customers. Then there are farmers and ranchers and other producers, so many of whom need us to act and act quickly.

Now, Congress is not known for acting with speed and dispatch, and at most times that is actually probably a good thing because you make mistakes when you get in a big hurry, but there is no reason we can't come together and reach an agreement this week and get relief on the way to those who need it most.

The Senate should not recess—we should not go back home for the August break—until the next coronavirus bill is complete. So we really have a choice. We can do this the hard way or we can do it the commonsense and easier way, which is simply to sit down, come together, and work our way through our differences. We know how to do it because we do it all the time, and it is the only way anything gets done.

So we need to put the grandstanding and the posturing and the rhetoric and the politicalization of this pandemic on the shelf for the time being. There is plenty of time for elections. The election is 93 days off from today, but what is urgent and what is needed most is for us to demonstrate that we can lead during a time of crisis. When our constituents, the American people, are in pain and hurting and need our help, we need to demonstrate we can work our differences out and come together and respond to that need.

Despite the immense challenges presented by the virus, tens of millions of essential workers have continued to go to work each day because their communities depend on them. We all depend on them. Right now, our country is depending on us to do our job, and we cannot let them down.

As school leaders make tough decisions today and continue to assess the situation, we need to ensure that they have the resources they need to keep their students healthy and their education on track.

This is not a zero-sum game. It is not one or the other. We have to do both.

The HEALS Act that was introduced by a number of colleagues on this side of the aisle included \$105 billion for education, more than tripling the investment made in the CARES Act, which we passed late in March. The majority of that funding goes to K-12 schools and will support safety measures for students and also provide better access to those studying remotely at home. It will bolster the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund with an additional \$29 billion to ensure that colleges and universities can make ac-

commodations not only for learning on campus but also the living, eating, and the range of other activities that occur on university campuses.

At least 10 percent of that funding is dedicated to the historically Black colleges and universities and minority-serving institutions.

Keeping Texas children healthy and their education on track is a top priority. It should be a top priority here and for all of us, and the next relief bill must provide the funding for our students and teachers that they need as they head into this new territory this fall.

In addition to supporting our children going back to school, another issue that has reared its head is childcare because, for many parents, if their children are not studying in classrooms, they are studying at home, and they need supervision. Many parents who would like to go back to work, if they can do so safely, need to have childcare available for them to be able to do so.

In 2018, 60 percent of Texas children under the age of 6 had all their available parents in the workforce—60 percent. And prior to COVID-19, many of these working parents relied on daycare so they could go to work.

Of course, the pandemic has changed childcare arrangements for many families. Those who have been able to telework have often pulled double duty as employees and caregivers at the same time, and those who, unfortunately, lost their jobs or were laid off have stayed home with children until they have been able to return to work.

But, really, childcare will be a huge limiting factor for many, many people who want to and can safely return to work. Now that more businesses are reopening, parents are increasingly in need of safe, reliable childcare, and Congress needs to step up and provide relief to childcare providers.

The HEALS Act authorizes short-term assistance to help them so they can safely reopen their doors and parents can safely return to work. This is, I believe, a key to getting more people back to work so we can begin to recover and rebuild our economy.

This legislation builds on another provision in the CARES Act that provided students student loan relief for the more than 43 million Americans with student loan debt. It allowed students to defer student loan payments for up to 6 months with no penalty. I have gotten a lot of positive feedback on that provision from Texans across nearly every part of the State.

With so much economic uncertainty, we can't allow that provision to expire. Student loan debt is a real and growing problem in our country, and families should never be in the situation where they are sacrificing their basic needs just to make those student loan payments, especially during the time of a global emergency.

As we try to find consensus on the next coronavirus response package,

there is no room to compromise on support for our children and teachers.

Another critical provision of supporting our schools is liability protections.

As I mentioned, schools are weighing whether to reopen, and they go through a long list of considerations. The number of cases of COVID virus in their community, new case trends, the risk to student health and teachers, the ability to implement relevant health guidelines—school leaders are weighing all of these factors and more in determining whether to reopen their doors. But even if a school is prepared to take every precaution and make a good-faith effort to protect the health and safety of students and staff, they can still face a mountain of lawsuits.

Let's say a district has carefully considered all of these factors and made the decision to reopen. They are prepared to implement the CDC guidelines and mitigation strategies—things like social distancing, masks, handwashing, reduced class sizes, and cohorting students. They have made changes to the bus routes, classroom seating, and lunch schedules to accommodate social distancing. They have talked to parents about how to identify the symptoms of COVID-19 and have planned for what they should do if a student or staff member tests positive.

Despite taking every precaution and closely following guidelines, the schools could still be sued for COVID-19 exposure. If a child contracts the virus, a parent could file a lawsuit blaming the school. Even though it would be extremely difficult—if not impossible—to prove the school was at fault, the district could be drawn into a costly court battle to defend itself, taking money and time away from classrooms needed to teach our children.

In Arizona, this has arisen as a major issue. The largest insurer for schools announced it will not provide liability coverage for COVID-19 claims. Without action from Congress, many schools may choose not to reopen their doors because the risk of expensive litigation is simply too high.

It is not just litigating and losing that is such a burden. By litigating, you actually can lose even if you win the case because of the cost associated with defending these cases and the time and energy it takes that could be expended on educating our children.

That is why the legislation I have introduced, known as the SAFE Act, which is included in the HEALS Act, is so important. It will prevent schools that make a good-faith effort to safely reopen from facing a wave of opportunistic litigation.

It doesn't provide blanket immunity. It actually incentivizes following public health guidelines and says that only those who engage in willful or grossly negligent conduct can be sued and recovery sought. But it does spell out in black and white that K-12 schools, colleges, and universities will be pro-

tected from COVID-19 exposure claims as long as they make a good-faith effort to comply with mandatory public health guidelines.

This is the targeted and temporary provision. It expires in 2024. This is not an attempt to permanently change the tort laws that apply across the board but only a targeted provision that applies to this pandemic.

Our schools need to know and have confidence that if they are operating in good faith and obeying guidelines, they will not spend the next years in court fighting lawsuits.

In order for our country to recover, these workers and institutions need to be able to open their doors and to do their jobs with confidence. That is precisely what this legislation will provide.

I hope our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in providing this critical funding and the protections our schools need at such a crucial time. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL DAVID L. GOLDFEIN AND CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT KALETH O. WRIGHT

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and congratulate two of my favorite people—Gen. David L. Goldfein and CMSAF Kaleth O. Wright on their upcoming retirement from the U.S. Air Force after a combined 68 years of distinguished military service to our great Nation.

General Goldfein's outstanding 37-year career has culminated as the 21st Chief of Staff of the Air Force. In this role, he has been responsible for the organization, training, and equipping of 685,000 Active-Duty, Guard, Reserve, and Civilian Forces serving all over the world. He has been crucial to strengthening our national security and has led the effort on shaping the Air Force and Joint Force of the future.

General Goldfein launched his career at the Air Force Academy. He graduated in 1983 and continued his training at the United States Air Force Weapons School. He would go on to earn his command pilot rating, accumulating more than 4,200 flying hours in various aircraft, such as the T-37, T-38, F-16, F-117, MQ-9, and MC-12.

He flew combat missions in Operations Desert Shield, Desert Storm, Allied Force and Enduring Freedom. On May 2, 1999, while flying a night mission during Operation Allied Force, then Lieutenant Colonel Goldfein found himself in the skies above Serbia in his F-16 fighter jet. His mission was to bomb targets designed to force the Serbian dictator, Slobodan Milosevic, to withdraw his troops from Kosovo.

Things changed rapidly when an air missile exploded through the belly of his aircraft, forcing him to eject and parachute into enemy territory. He was quickly rescued in Kosovo by the Air Force's elite combat search and rescue team.

His ability to make sound decisions under this extreme pressure and many

other actions throughout his career are why he was the right person to serve as Chief of Staff for the past 4 years. General Goldfein epitomizes the finest qualities of a military leader. His passion for the Air Force, the airmen, and their families—this certainly is a family affair—is unparalleled, and the country owes him a debt of gratitude for his sacrifice and for his service.

I would also like to recognize Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force Wright for his exceptional 31-year career in the U.S. Air Force. For the past 3½ years, he has served as the senior enlisted advisor to the Air Force Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Air Force on all issues regarding the welfare, the readiness, the morale, and proper utilization and progress of the enlisted force.

After enlisting in the Air Force in 1989, Chief Wright would go on to serve in various duties in the dental career field. He deployed in support of Operations Desert Shield, Desert Storm, and Enduring Freedom and completed overseas tours in South Korea, Japan, Germany, and Alaska.

As the 18th Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, his transparent leadership, character, and natural charisma built a never-before-seen trust with the 410,000 enlisted members. Under his leadership, improvements were made to the enlisted professional military education system, enlisted promotion system, physical training testing, and the enlisted evaluation system. His passion for building a resilient force, suicide prevention, and diversity and inclusion will have lasting positive impacts on the service, the airmen, and their families.

Fittingly, Chief Wright will continue to advocate for airmen as the next CEO of the Air Force Aid Society. As co-chair of the Senate Air Force Caucus and Chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee responsible for ensuring our Armed Forces and their families have the infrastructure and facilities to support their needs, I have met with these Air Force leaders on numerous occasions during their service, as they encouraged congressional support to strengthen Air Force priorities and military readiness. Airmen can be proud of their advocacy and leadership to ensure the United States maintains our air superiority.

On behalf of the U.S. Senate, the Senate Air Force Caucus, and a grateful nation, I extend my deepest appreciation to General Goldfein, Chief Master Sergeant Wright, and their families for their many, many years of exemplary military service and sacrifice. We all wish them nothing but the very best in the future.

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS DECECY ACT

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, for almost 25 years, the internet has grown and thrived under the light-touch regulatory framework established by the Communications Decency Act. I hope we can continue that. I think some changes need to be made.

Passed in 1996, the law that the Communications Decency Act is a part of helped create the internet. Section 230 of that law gives broad liability protections to interactive computer services, such as Facebook, Twitter, and other social media platforms. This provision protects online platforms from being held liable for content posted by their users.

This is a unique protection for online platforms, and not everyone in our country enjoys those protections. For example, newspapers do not enjoy this important protection. But we have done this for internet platforms.

At the same time, section 230 of the Communications Decency Act allows online platforms to censor content that they—the platforms—consider obscene, lewd, harassing, along with several other categories, including the term “otherwise objectionable.”

I am concerned that this term, “otherwise objectionable,” is too broad and ends up protecting online platforms when they remove content that they simply disagree with or dislike or find distasteful personally.

I fear section 230 has enabled big tech companies to censor conservative views and voices, and I am joined by a lot of Americans in that view. As such, this provision has become a loophole for censoring free speech, and it risks negating the values at the very heart of our First Amendment.

In the last few years, reports of online censorship of conservative viewpoints have grown more frequent. In early 2018, for example, an undercover report exposed Twitter for systematically “shadow banning” conservative profiles—meaning users were blocked from the platform without being notified.

More recently, Google threatened to demonetize a conservative news site, The Federalist, for not removing offensive content in their comment section. Based upon information I received, the comments may indeed have been derogatory and unacceptable. But what is noteworthy is that Google’s threat toward the Federalist was hyperselective and a bit hypocritical. Google held the Federalist accountable for comments made by the Federalist readers, but Google does not want to be held responsible for the posts or comments by users on Google’s platforms, including YouTube—a double standard imposed by Google itself. This selective scrutiny reveals what most Americans already believe: that tech companies are politically biased.

According to a 2018 Pew study, 7 out of 10 Americans believed social media

companies censor political viewpoints that they find objectionable. That was 2 years ago. It has only worsened in the 2 years since then.

These concerns come at a time when tech companies wield unprecedented power within our economy and our culture at large, and no one can deny that. A bipartisan chorus of committee members from the other body pointed this out just last week. More and more of our daily business is taking place online, and that trend is only accelerating during the current pandemic.

As we near the 2020 election, Americans have serious concerns about whether online platforms will treat campaigns on both sides of the aisle fairly and equally. Those concerns are warranted. I have those concerns. Americans are right to be worried about interference by politically homogenous tech firms that hold unprecedented sway over our Nation’s political discourse.

After 24 years, it is time for Congress to revisit section 230 of the Communications Decency Act and start with refining—perhaps narrowing—the scope of what counts as otherwise objectionable content subject to censors. There may be other reforms that would be better, but I think it is time for Congress and the committee that I chair to revisit this section of the law.

Last week, the Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet convened a hearing to consider exactly this issue, and it was a very good hearing. As chairman of the Commerce Committee, I intend to pursue this matter thoroughly and evaluate what changes are needed to section 230. Congress needs to ensure that the internet remains a forum for a “true diversity of political discourse” that promotes competition and innovation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The clerk will call the roll. The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CHINA

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, last week, journalists at ESPN published the results of a bombshell investigation into human rights violations at NBA training academies in China.

When you think about a basketball camp, you probably think of shooting drills or running sprints, but these camps look much different. The investigation focused on training camps located in Xinjiang. This particular region in western China has achieved a certain level of notoriety in recent months for the horrific political violence its government officials inflict on the Uighur Muslim minority. So it is no surprise that the stories told by trainers, coaches, and other NBA employees who helped to run these camps

employ disturbing and familiar imagery.

According to the ESPN investigation, one former league employee compared the atmosphere at the Xinjiang camp to “World War II Germany.”

An American coach, who worked at a similar facility, described it as a “sweat camp for athletes.”

Now, according to the investigation, almost immediately after the NBA launched this program back in 2016, multiple coaches who were staffing the camps reported to high-ranking organization officials that they had witnessed Chinese coaches beating and berating student athletes. Bear in mind that these reports were made in 2016. They also reported that the Chinese Communist Party officials who were in charge of the camp were denying students an education.

In coming to this elite camp, they were to receive both an education and elevated sports training, but the reports, going back to 2016, said the children were being abused, beaten, berated, and denied the education. So why then did the NBA maintain these programs?

Money.

Communist China plays host to an estimated \$4 billion NBA market. They say that China is basketball-obsessed, and NBA execs have used every avenue they can to take advantage of that, and they jealously protect these relationships.

Last October, when Houston Rockets’ General Manager Daryl Morey tweeted in support of the Hong Kong Freedom Fighters, multiple league all-stars, stakeholders, and well-connected employees lashed out in a panic—terrified of retaliation from Beijing.

Team owner and Alibaba co-founder Joe Tsai not only sided with the Chinese Communist Party as it retaliated against the entire league, but he characterized the Hong Kong protesters as leading a separatist movement.

Their over-the-top reactions are proof enough of how fragile the NBA’s relationship with China actually is and who is really in control of this relationship. The control is not with the NBA.

In June, I sent a letter to the NBA, expressing my concerns about the training camps in Xinjiang and the league’s entanglement with the Chinese Communist Party. In their response, they announced that they had closed their facilities in the region and that they had severed their ties to any programs there.

The problem is that the ESPN report I referenced previously disputes that assertion. I am reaching out for clarification on that matter, but in their response, I hope NBA officials express clarity regarding all—each and every one—of their business relationships with China because the NBA and other organizations that maintain close ties to the Chinese Communist Party believe that they are merely taking advantage of a growing consumer market—or that is what they say. To them,

it is the smart, savvy play. That is what they believe. In reality, what they are doing is giving the ball away. They are playing right into Beijing's hands, and those hands are controlled by the Chinese Communist Party.

Since 2013, the CCP has operated under a grand strategy to stretch its influence across Europe, Africa, and Asia. This strategy is known as—quite elegantly, they think—the Belt and Road Initiative. It involves making interlinked investments over land and sea, which has formed the beginnings of a modern day Silk Road.

The Chinese Communist Party uses energy and transportation infrastructure development, as well as access to investment capital and trade opportunities, to force its way into the good graces of comparatively poor and still-developing nations.

I have seen this influence and its effects firsthand. Last year, I traveled to the Horn of Africa and spent some time in Djibouti—a country that welcomed China and the Belt and Road Initiative investments with open arms.

China now holds somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 percent of that country's national debt. This is 80 percent of its debt that is held by Communist China. The government in Djibouti, in turn, agreed to accommodate China's first overseas military outpost, grant access to a crucial sea lane, and implement the Orwellian smart cities program.

Now, I will tell you, if I asked you to picture a modern day surveillance state, the chances are the picture that would pop into your head would come pretty close to being what is happening right now in Djibouti City.

Yet the other thing I saw while in Djibouti was its vital strategic importance to the United States. Our military relationship is one that exists on the frontlines of great power competition, and it is essential to continue American commitment to and investment in African partners like Djibouti.

Wherever AFRICOM headquarters is located, we must not lose sight of the importance of resourcing the African continent for great power competition. This is the combatant command that consistently proves it can “do the most with the least,” and it is a front where we can play offense, not defense, against two of our major adversaries—China and Russia.

The way China does business makes maintaining these relationships incredibly important. The BRI functions behind a veil of secrecy to the tune of somewhere between \$1 trillion and \$8 trillion in foreign investment. Now, think about this. China invests its dollars in the United States. Currently, China holds over \$1.1 trillion in U.S. debt. It does that because Congress has the power of the purse, but Congress seems to think: Print more money. We can issue some debt. We can afford it. All the while, China is making money off of our debt. Then, with those profits, what is it doing? It is investing in countries around the globe.

As I said, with what we know now about the Belt and Road Initiative—the digital Silk Road, its push in the great power competition—it has now spent somewhere between \$1 trillion and \$8 trillion around the globe. Some of these countries, like Djibouti, are holding 80 percent of the debt in exchange for locating a military post, for having a naval base, for building out its spy network globally. This is what it is up to.

The low-interest loans China offers leads these countries into unsustainable debt burdens. Some countries' overall debts to China are well above 20 percent of their GDPs, and many of these loan recipients exist on the brink of a debt crisis. When you get in a debt crisis—when your debt is more than your income—what happens? The person holding your debt does what? We know. The person owns you.

In short, China has set a series of “debt traps” for smaller, struggling countries so they will just go tumbling over the cliff. For China, everything is going according to plan because that dependency translates to control over key strategic positions all over the globe.

Yet, pretty soon, if they are not careful, organizations like the NBA, the National Basketball Association, will be the “National Beijing Association.” What is it doing? It is ignoring this. Why is it ignoring it? Because it is convenient. Why is it convenient? The profits look good. It is making money. China is basketball-obsessed. Do we really think that makes it OK? I have to say that it is not OK.

What the NBA is doing is ignoring horrific human rights abuses—absolutely horrific. It is ignoring speech repression. It is ignoring political violence. It is ignoring religious persecution. It is doing it all in the name of finding its next basketball superstar, and it remains willfully blind to the manipulation tactics China uses to hide these abuses.

Whether we are talking about debt diplomacy or enthusiastic access to a willing market, all of it is offered up by the Chinese Communist Party as a distraction.

I have said repeatedly that the United States must take immediate steps to unravel our relationships with China. The rapid and unnecessary spread of COVID-19, caused by the Chinese Communist Party's reckless attitude in the early days of the pandemic, is proof enough of how dangerously vulnerable we are to the Chinese influence, but this unraveling cannot occur if governments and organizations alike refuse to acknowledge what the American people know to be true, which is that we had a real chance to keep China in check, but we missed the opportunity.

The only way that we can retake control of our interactions with Beijing is to retake control of our economy and set our own parameters for engage-

ment with what has become one of the most dangerous and powerful nations on the planet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the previously referenced article from ESPN, dated July 29, 2020.

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

[From ESPN.com, July 29, 2020]

ESPN INVESTIGATION FINDS COACHES AT NBA CHINA ACADEMIES COMPLAINED OF PLAYER ABUSE, LACK OF SCHOOLING
(By Steve Fainaru and Mark Fainaru-Wada)

Long before an October tweet in support of Hong Kong protesters spotlighted the NBA's complicated relationship with China, the league faced complaints from its own employees over human rights concerns inside an NBA youth-development program in that country, an ESPN investigation has found.

American coaches at three NBA training academies in China told league officials their Chinese partners were physically abusing young players and failing to provide schooling, even though commissioner Adam Silver had said that education would be central to the program, according to multiple sources with direct knowledge of the complaints.

The NBA ran into myriad problems by opening one of the academies in Xinjiang, a police state in western China where more than a million Uighur Muslims are now held in barbed-wire camps. American coaches were frequently harassed and surveilled in Xinjiang, the sources said. One American coach was detained three times without cause; he and others were unable to obtain housing because of their status as foreigners.

A former league employee compared the atmosphere when he worked in Xinjiang to “World War II Germany.”

In an interview with ESPN about its findings, NBA deputy commissioner and chief operating officer Mark Tatum, who oversees international operations, said the NBA is “reevaluating” and “considering other opportunities” for the academy program, which operates out of sports facilities run by the Chinese government. Last week, the league acknowledged for the first time it had closed the Xinjiang academy, but, when pressed, Tatum declined to say whether human rights were a factor.

“We were somewhat humbled,” Tatum said of the academy project in China. “One of the lessons that we’ve learned here is that we do need to have more direct oversight and the ability to make staffing changes when appropriate.”

In October, Houston Rockets general manager Daryl Morey's tweet in support of pro-democracy protesters led the Chinese government to pull the NBA from state television, costing the league hundreds of millions of dollars. The controversy continues to reverberate, as the NBA prepares to resume play this week after a 4½-month hiatus because of the coronavirus pandemic. China Central TV recently said it still won't air NBA games, and U.S. lawmakers have raised questions about the league's business ties to China.

The ESPN investigation, which began after Morey's tweet, sheds new light on the lucrative NBA-China relationship and the costs of doing business with a government that suppresses free expression and is accused of cultural genocide. It illustrates the challenges of operating in a society with markedly different approaches to issues such as discipline, education and security. The reporting is based on interviews with several former NBA employees with direct knowledge of the league's activities in China, particularly the player-development program.

The program, launched in 2016, is part of the NBA's strategy to develop local players in a basketball-obsessed market that has made NBA China a \$5 billion enterprise. Most of the former employees spoke on the condition of anonymity because they feared damaging their chances for future employment. NBA officials asked current and former employees not to speak with ESPN for this story. In an email to one former coach, a public relations official added: "Please don't mention that you have been advised by the NBA not to respond."

One American coach who worked for the NBA in China described the project as "a sweat camp for athletes."

At least two coaches left their positions in response to what they believed was mistreatment of young players.

One requested and received a transfer after watching Chinese coaches strike teenage players, three sources told ESPN. Another American coach left before the end of his contract because he found the lack of education in the academies unconscionable: "I couldn't continue to show up every day, looking at these kids and knowing they would end up being taxi drivers," he said.

Not long after the academies opened, multiple coaches complained about the physical abuse and lack of schooling to Greg Stolt, the league's vice president for international operations for NBA China, and to other league officials in China, the sources said. It was unclear whether the information was passed on to NBA officials in New York, they said. The NBA declined to make Stolt available for comment.

Two of the former NBA employees separately told ESPN that coaches at the academies regularly speculated about whether Silver had been informed about the problems. "I said, 'If [Silver] shows up, we're all fired immediately,'" one of the coaches said.

Tatum said the NBA received "a handful" of complaints that Chinese coaches had mistreated young players and immediately informed local authorities that the league had "zero tolerance" for behavior that was "antithetical to our values." Tatum said the incidents were not reported at the time to league officials in New York, including himself or Silver.

"I will tell you that the health and wellness of academy athletes and everyone who participates in our program is of the utmost priority," Tatum said.

Tatum identified four separate incidents, though he said only one was formally reported in writing by an NBA employee. On three of the occasions, the coaches reported witnessing or hearing about physical abuse. The fourth incident involved a player who suffered from heat exhaustion.

"We did everything that we could, given the limited oversight we had," Tatum said.

Three sources who worked for the NBA in China told ESPN the physical abuse by Chinese coaches was much more prevalent than the incidents Tatum identified.

The NBA brought in elite coaches and athletic trainers with experience in the G League and Division I basketball to work at the academies. One former coach described watching a Chinese coach fire a ball into a young player's face at point-blank range and then "kick him in the gut."

"Imagine you have a kid who's 13, 14 years old, and you've got a grown coach who is 40 years old hitting your kid," the coach said. "We're part of that. The NBA is part of that."

It is common for Chinese coaches to discipline players physically, according to several people with experience in player development in China. "For most of the older generation, even my grandparents, they take corporal punishment for granted and even

see it as an expression of love and care, but I know it might be criticized by people living outside of China," said Jinming Zheng, an assistant professor of sports management at Northumbria University in England, who grew up in mainland China and has written extensively about the Chinese sports system. "The older generation still sees it as an integral part of training."

In 2012, the NBA hired Bruce Palmer to work as technical director at a private basketball school in Dongguan in southern China, a program that predated the academies. The school has a sponsorship agreement that pays the NBA nearly \$200,000 a year and allows the school to bill itself as an "NBA Training Center."

Palmer spent five years in Dongguan and said he repeatedly warned Chinese coaches not to hit, kick or throw balls at children. After one incident, he said he told a coach: "You can't do that to your kid, this is an NBA training center. If you really feel like hitting a 14-year-old boy, and you think it's going to help him or make you feel better, take him off campus, but not here, because the NBA does not allow this."

Palmer said the school's headmaster told him that hitting kids has "been proven to be effective as a teaching tool."

The issue was so prevalent in the NBA academies that coaches repeatedly asked NBA China officials, including Stolt, for direction on how to handle what they saw as physical abuse, according to three sources. The coaches were told to file written reports to the NBA office in Shanghai. One coach said he encountered no more issues after filing a report, but the others said the abuse continued.

"We weren't responsible for the local coaches, we didn't have the authority," Tatum said. "We don't have oversight of the local coaches, of the academic programs or the living conditions. It's fair to say we were less involved than we wanted to be."

With a population four times the size of the U.S., China is an exploding market for the NBA. The league's soaring revenues were propelled in part by the success of former Rockets center Yao Ming, who retired in 2011.

Tatum said the league sought advice from Yao and other experts in China on the development of its academy program. He also said NBA China's board of directors was briefed on the planning and placement of the three academies, including Xinjiang, adding that ESPN holds a seat on the board. An ESPN spokesperson said the network "is a non-voting board observer and owns a small stake" in NBA China, declining any further comment. (Games are streamed in China by internet giant Tencent, which also has a partnership with ESPN.)

Launching the academies had a primary goal for NBA bosses: "Find another Yao," according to two of the former employees who spoke with ESPN.

When Silver announced the plan to open three league-run academies in China in 2016, he said the goal was to train elite athletes "holistically."

"Top international prospects will benefit from a complete approach to player development that combines NBA quality coaching, training and competition with academics and personal development," Silver said.

The league's news release announcing the academies said, "The initiative will employ a holistic, 360-degree approach to player development with focuses on education, leadership, character development and life skills."

The NBA employees who spoke with ESPN said many of the league's problems stemmed from the decision to embed the academies in government-run sports facilities. The facilities gave the NBA access to existing infra-

structure and elite players, Tatum said. But the arrangement put NBA activities under the direction of Chinese officials who selected the players and helped define the training.

"We were basically working for the Chinese government," one former coach said.

After his work in the NBA-sponsored facility in Dongguan, the league hired Palmer to evaluate the academies. He concluded the program was "fundamentally flawed." Palmer said it not only put NBA employees under Chinese authority but also prevented the league from working with China's most elite players.

In hindsight, Tatum said, the NBA might have been "a little bit naive" to believe the structure gave the league sufficient oversight.

In Xinjiang, players lived in cramped dormitories; the rooms were meant for two people, but a former coach said bunk beds were used to put as many as eight to 10 athletes in a room. Players trained two or three times a day and had few extracurricular activities. NBA coaches and officials became concerned that although education had been announced as a pillar of the academy program, the sports bureaus did not provide formal schooling. When the players—some as young as 13—weren't training, eating or sleeping, they were often left unsupervised.

One coach said league officials who visited China seemed to be caught off-guard when they learned that players in the NBA academies did not attend school.

The NBA was able to work out an arrangement by which players at the academy in Zhejiang would be educated at a local international school. But similar efforts in Xinjiang and Shandong were unsuccessful.

Tatum said Chinese officials told the NBA that players at the academies would take classes six days a week in subjects such as English, math and sports psychology. He said when NBA employees later raised questions about whether the kids were in school, the Chinese officials reassured them they were.

But two former league employees said they complained directly to Stolt, who's based in Shanghai, that the players under their supervision were not in school.

Within the past month, as the NBA prepared to resume play in Florida, it began to face new questions about its relationship with China. Sen. Marsha Blackburn, R-Tenn., and Sen. Josh Hawley, R-Mo., sent separate letters to Silver questioning why the NBA is promoting social justice at home while ignoring China's abuses. The letters came shortly after China announced a new national security law in Hong Kong that gives authorities sweeping powers to crack down on pro-Democracy protesters. Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas, also recently sparred on Twitter with Mavericks owner Mark Cuban over China.

Hawley's letter challenged the NBA for excluding messages supporting human rights in China among statements that players can wear on their jerseys. The approved messages are limited to social justice and the Black Lives Matter movement.

"Given the NBA's troubled history of excusing and apologizing for the brutal repression of the Chinese Communist regime, these omissions are striking," Hawley wrote in the letter, which was sent to media members.

One recipient, ESPN reporter Adrian Wojnarowski, replied with a profanity, which Hawley then tweeted out to his 235,000 followers. ESPN and Wojnarowski issued separate apologies, and the reporter was suspended for two weeks without pay.

In Xinjiang, the NBA opened an academy in a region notorious for human rights abuses.

In recent years, the Chinese government has escalated its use of high-tech surveillance, restricted freedom of movement and erected mass internment facilities, which the government describes as vocational training centers and critics describe as concentration camps holding ethnic minorities, particularly Uighur Muslims. The government says the policy is necessary to combat terrorism. In September, the United States joined more than 30 countries in condemning “China’s horrific campaign of repression” against the Uighurs. Reports of separatist violence and Chinese government repression in Xinjiang go back decades.

Tatum said the NBA wasn’t aware of political tensions or human rights issues in Xinjiang when it announced it was launching the training academy there in 2016.

In the spring of 2018, the U.S. began considering sanctions against China over human rights concerns there, and the issue became the subject of increasing media coverage within the United States. In August 2018, Slate published an article under the headline: “Why is the NBA in Xinjiang? The league is running a training center in the middle of one of the world’s worst humanitarian atrocities.”

Later, the NBA would receive criticism from congressional leaders, but it never addressed the concerns or said anything about the status of the facility until last week.

Sometime shortly after Morey’s October tweet, the academy webpage was taken down.

Pressed by ESPN, Tatum repeatedly avoided questions on whether the widespread human rights abuses in Xinjiang played a role in closing the academy, instead citing “many factors.”

“My job, our job is not to take a position on every single human rights violation, and I’m not an expert in every human rights situation or violation,” Tatum said. “I’ll tell you what the NBA stands for: The values of the NBA are about respect, are about inclusion, are about diversity. That is what we stand for.”

Nury Turkel, a Uighur American activist who has been heavily involved in lobbying the U.S. government on Uighur rights, told ESPN before the NBA said it had left Xinjiang that he believed the league had been indirectly legitimizing “crimes against humanity.”

One former league employee who worked in China wondered how the NBA, which has been so progressive on issues around Black Lives Matter and moved the 2017 All-Star Game out of Charlotte, North Carolina, over a law requiring transgender people to use bathrooms corresponding to the sex listed on their birth certificates, could operate a training camp amid a Chinese government crackdown that also targeted NBA employees.

“You can’t have it both ways,” the former employee said. “. . . You can’t be over here in February promoting Black History Month and be over in China, where they’re in reeducation camps and all the people that you’re partnering with are hitting kids.”

Tatum said the NBA “has a long history and our values are about inclusion and respect and bridging cultural divides. That is what we stand for and that is who we are as an organization. We do think that engagement is the best way to bridge cultural divides, the best way to grow the game across borders.”

The repression in Xinjiang is aimed primarily at Uighurs, but foreigners also have been harassed. One American coach said he was stopped by police three times in 10 months. Once, he was taken to a station and held for more than two hours because he didn’t have his passport at the time. Because

of the security restrictions, foreigners were told they were not allowed to rent housing in Xinjiang; most lived at local hotels.

Tatum said the league wasn’t aware any of its employees had been detained or harassed in Xinjiang.

Most of the players who trained at the NBA’s Xinjiang academy were Uighurs, but it was unclear to league employees who spoke with ESPN if any were impacted by the government crackdown.

After returning from Xinjiang last fall, Corbin Loubert, a strength coach who joined the NBA after stints at the IMG Academy in Florida and The Citadel, posted a CNN story on Twitter describing how the network’s reporters faced surveillance and intimidation in Xinjiang.

“I spent the past year living in Xinjiang, and can confirm every word of this piece is true,” Loubert tweeted. “One of the biggest challenges was not only the discrimination and harassment I faced,” he added, “but turning a blind eye to the discrimination and harassment that the Uyghur people around me faced.”

Loubert declined several interview requests from ESPN.

In a bipartisan letter to Silver last October after Morey’s tweet, eight U.S. legislators—including Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, D-N.Y., and Cruz—called for the NBA to “re-evaluate” the Xinjiang academy in response to “a massive, government-run campaign of ethno-religious repression.”

Even though the NBA now says it had left Xinjiang in the spring of 2019, the league did not respond to the letter. The Xinjiang academy webpage disappeared soon after.

Last week, in response to Sen. Blackburn of Tennessee, the league wrote, “The NBA has had no involvement with the Xinjiang basketball academy for more than a year, and the relationship has been terminated.”

John Pomfret, whose 2016 book, “The Beautiful Country and the Middle Kingdom” covers the history of the U.S.-China relationship, called the decision to put an academy in Xinjiang “a huge mistake” that made the NBA “party to a massive human rights violation.”

“Shutting it down was probably the smartest thing to do,” he said. “But you can clearly understand from the NBA’s point of view why they wouldn’t want to make an announcement: Then you’re just rubbing China’s nose in it. What would you say, ‘We’re leaving because of human rights concerns?’ That’s worse than Morey’s tweet.”

Tatum said the league decided to end its involvement with the Xinjiang facility because it “didn’t have the authority, or the ability to take direct action against any of these local coaches, and we ultimately concluded that the program there was unsalvageable.”

Tatum said the NBA informed its coaches in Xinjiang that the league planned to cease operations, and coaches were then “moved out.” But when Tatum was told that multiple sources had told ESPN that the NBA never informed the coaches of its plans to close Xinjiang, Tatum said he wasn’t actually sure what conversations had taken place.

Two sources disputed that the NBA had any plans to leave Xinjiang in the spring of 2019. One coach said the league was still seeking other coaches to move there well into the summer and that the league’s statement to Blackburn was “completely inaccurate.”

“They were still trying to get people to go out there,” the coach said. “It didn’t end because [Tatum] said, ‘We’re gonna end this.’”

“They probably finally said, ‘Why are we doing this?’” he continued. “Like we told them from the start, ‘Why do we need to be

here? We’re the NBA, there’s no reasons for us to be here.”

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam 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 MARK WESLEY MENEZES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have come to the floor this afternoon to encourage Senators to support the nomination that is now pending before us. This is for Mark Menezes to be the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Energy.

I have had plenty of opportunity to be working with Mr. Menezes, as he has been with the Department of Energy for quite some time.

He originally hails from Louisiana. He earned his undergraduate and law degrees at Louisiana State University. He has, as I mentioned, considerable experience in the energy sector and here on Capitol Hill. He previously served as chief counsel for energy and environment on the House Energy and Commerce Committee. So he has been around for a fair period of time.

But more recently, for the past 3 years now, Mr. Menezes has served as the Department’s Under Secretary of Energy, and in that role, he has been responsible for many programs that help drive the innovation within the Department, including for renewable energy, as well as nuclear energy.

Mr. Menezes also helped create the Department’s cybersecurity office, which is dedicated to protecting our energy infrastructure from what has become very sophisticated and near-constant threats.

As Members may recall, the Senate confirmed Mr. Menezes to his current role by voice vote. I believe he has excelled as the Under Secretary of Energy. He has helped to set the policy direction of the Department. He has worked with many of us on issues that are important to our States and to the country as a whole.

I am also confident that Mr. Menezes will be a great second-in-command for Secretary Brouillette. We held Mr. Menezes’s nomination hearing back on May 20. This was our first hearing that we had held after several months lost due to the pandemic.

Mr. Menezes did, not surprisingly, very, very well. He demonstrated his knowledge of the issues; he showed us that he understands what it takes to help lead the Department; and that enabled us to report his nomination to the full Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support.

So we are sitting here now—it has been nearly a 2-month delay—and I am very pleased that we are about to vote on Mr. Menezes’s nomination. It is really key. It is very important that

Secretary Brouillette has his leadership team in place, and Mr. Menezes has demonstrated that he has the knowledge and the experience needed to succeed as Deputy Secretary.

So I appreciate, and I have shared this with Mr. Menezes, his willingness to serve our country in a new and a higher capacity, particularly as we seek to harness the Department's capabilities to overcome and recover from the COVID-19 pandemic.

I thank the majority leader for bringing up his nomination. I would urge every Member to vote in favor of it on cloture today and on confirmation tomorrow.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, before I yield the floor to my friend and colleague, the ranking member on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I want to take just a very, very, very brief moment and urge us, at this moment, on the 3rd of August, as we are commencing this workweek here, where the expectation from people from Alaska to West Virginia and all points in between is that this Congress is going to come together to be responsive to the needs of the most vulnerable in this country right now—the vulnerability that has come about because of a global health pandemic and the ensuing economic crisis that we see now.

I spent the weekend back home in Alaska. I heard the concerns and the fears of so many for whom things are not getting better. Things are looking worse, and it is bleak. As of today, in the State's largest city, the mayor has recognized that with the numbers increasing as they are, we need to go back to the hunker-down mode. So restaurants and bars are shutting down again—just after they thought, with some level of optimism, they would be able to bring folks back into work, they would be able to fill up the freezers and get the produce and get the great salmon that is coming in off the streams and serve up some great meals. That is not happening.

So that economic picture in our largest community is bleaker and bleaker. And for those who wake up and know that today is the day that they have to pay the mortgage, they have to pay the rent, and they don't know what level of assistance is going to be coming from their Congress—they do know, though, that the unemployment benefits that they had received, the plussed-up amount, that that is not on the horizon for them.

They do know that school is opening up in 20 days, and there is uncertainty with how the schools are going to safely open up for the children and for the faculty, the teachers, the janitors, how they are going to make that work. And, oh, by the way, if this is a schedule where the kids are only in class for a couple days a week, for a shorter time period, how do I deal with the struggles and the challenges of childcare?

The folks at the food bank whom I met with over the weekend who are so

concerned about the food security issues, for them, recognizing that a plus-up in SNAP may be—may be what gets that family through from week to week.

This is not the time for us to figure out what every one of us wants because this is the must-pass bill in this Congress. It is a must-pass bill. But we have to recognize that this can't be about what we need, what I might need for my election, or what I might want to advance as a legacy piece. This needs to be about those for whom the anxiety and the—just the awful place they are in right now; that they know we have been responsive to them; that we are addressing the immediacy of now.

So whether it is what we do with unemployment insurance, whether it is what we do with food security, childcare, a longer term PPP program that will help our businesses, the short-term assistances—but understanding what it means for the longer term—the delay here only hurts the most vulnerable.

So I am urging all of us, let's come together, let's work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let's work with our colleagues over in the House, because people in my State are hurting, and they are expecting us to respond.

With that, I know that Senator MANCHIN wished to speak to the nomination of Mr. Menezes. I appreciate his good work on the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous to be able to complete my remarks.

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

NOMINATION OF MARK WESLEY MENEZES

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Mark Menezes nomination to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

I agree wholeheartedly with our chairwoman for Energy and Natural Resources. We have a great working relationship, and we have a good friendship that means more than anything to me.

But, basically, every now and then you get a person who comes before you that you know they are there for the good of the public. They are truly public servants, not for private service.

So this person comes across with so much expertise. That is going to play an important role in our national defense and our energy and economic security and our science and research and even in fighting the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and helping to rebuild our economy.

The Deputy Secretary plays a central role in all of these efforts, and I believe that Mr. Menezes is up to the task.

The Deputy Secretary is the second highest ranking officer in the Department of Energy and the Department's chief operating officer on top of that. He is responsible for managing the De-

partment's wide-ranging mission and a budget of over \$35 billion dollars—\$35-billion-dollar budget.

The DOE and its labs can also play a vital role in supporting the scientific research and development needed to rebuild our economy.

In addition, the Department is responsible for maintaining the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile, overseeing the four power marketing administrations, and ensuring our energy security and protecting the Nation's energy sector from cyber attacks, among other things.

As the Department's second highest ranking officer and its chief operating office, the Deputy Secretary necessarily plays a critical role in all of these important functions.

Mr. Menezes brings an impressive background to the job. Thirty years ago, he was counsel to our former colleague Senator John Breaux; 15 years ago, he was chief counsel to the House Energy and Commerce and played a major role in shaping the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

He has held senior posts at the American Electric Power Company, the Hunton and Williams law firm, and Berkshire Hathaway Energy.

Most importantly, though, for the past 3 years, he has served as the Under Secretary of Energy. As the Under Secretary of Energy, Mr. Menezes has shown he is up to the task and capable of handling the job of Deputy Secretary.

I think that he truly, clearly, demonstrated his knowledge and his firm grasp of the wide range of important issues before the Department during the confirmation hearing, and I am happy to support his nomination in the most bipartisan way.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, I would also like to make a few comments on what my good friend Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska said.

People are depending on us. This is not time to have political battles. People are hurting in West Virginia; they are hurting in Arkansas; they are hurting all over. The uncertainty hurts them more than anything else. We have to make sure that we understand this is a health crisis.

A health crisis needs to have its attention. We can't be closing hospitals in the middle of a health crisis. I have three rural hospitals that closed. We have to make sure that they stay open to fight the fight. Also, I am certain of one point. Unemployment is not going to come back full force until people know they have a vaccine or an antibody that will protect them from a fatal disease. They are concerned and worried about that.

With that being said, right now they are asking us to continue on for the next 5 months. We don't have connectivity. You talk about telework, distance learning, telehealth. They can't have any of this if they can't connect. So we have to make sure that one

major infrastructure project has to be connectivity—broadband and high speed. We have been working on hot spots just to get through these 5 months.

There are things we agree on. Democrats and Republicans are coming together as Americans. We agree. We would like to help. They are just arguing over amounts and this and that and the other.

The bottom line is that we have to agree on what we can agree on and meet the needs of the people on the frontlines. That is the most important thing. So I whole-heartedly engage in any type of bipartisan cooperation or bipartisan talks that we can move along to show people that we can put the needs of the public above the partisan divide that we have here and have had for a long time—since I have been here—and for decades.

I am happy to support Mr. Menezes, and I appreciate the bipartisan support we have for him.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Mark Wesley Menezes, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (HEINRICH), the Senator from Vermont (LEAHY), and the Senator from Vermont (SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 154 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Alexander	Enzi	Perdue
Baldwin	Ernst	Peters
Barrasso	Feinstein	Portman
Bennet	Fischer	Reed
Blackburn	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Booker	Grassley	Romney
Boozman	Hassan	Rounds
Braun	Hawley	Rubio
Brown	Hoeven	Sasse
Cantwell	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Jones	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Shelby
Casey	Kennedy	Sinema
Cassidy	King	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Loeffler	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Udall
Crapo	McSally	Van Hollen
Cruz	Murkowski	Warner
Daines	Murphy	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murray	Wicker
Durbin	Paul	Young

NAYS—14

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Markey	Schumer
Gillibrand	Menendez	Warren
Harris	Merkley	Wyden
Hirono	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—8

Burr	Leahy	Tillis
Heinrich	Moran	Toomey
Hyde-Smith	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 78, the nays are 14.

The motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

(At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD)

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS L. BOWLIN

• Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Thomas L. Bowlin, Colonel, USAF, Ret., who in addition to a distinguished career in the U.S. Air Force, has served as the first Director of Government Affairs for the North Carolina National Guard. I thank him for his many years of service to the great State of North Carolina and our great Nation.

Colonel Bowlin began his military career with the U.S. Air Force in 1975. He has served across the United States, as well as in Germany, Hawaii, Pakistan, and Alaska. He was the first USAF officer to attend Pakistan's War College and served in a number of key assignments with increasing levels of responsibility.

Following his retirement from the U.S. Air Force in 2001, Colonel Bowlin continued his dedication to service by beginning a second career and becoming the first Director of Government Affairs for the North Carolina National Guard. He served as an essential component of North Carolina National Guard leadership for nearly two decades where he has advised the adjutant general directly and interfaced with local, State, and Federal officials.

Colonel Bowlin has served roughly 11,500 citizen soldiers and airmen in the North Carolina Army and Air National Guard through many deployments overseas and harrowing natural disasters at home. Tom's contribution to advancing the overall readiness and operational capabilities of the North Carolina National Guard has been vital in maintaining an effective and resilient reserve force. Through operations including Inherent Resolve, Enduring Freedom, and Freedom's Sentinel, as well as during Hurricanes Irene, Matthew, Florence, and Dorian, Colonel Bowlin has ensured that the men and women of the Guard had the utmost preparation of every mission that they embarked upon.

Colonel Bowlin has worked tirelessly on a number of both Federal, State, and local priorities and policy reforms for the North Carolina National Guard. Just to name a few, these range from appropriations for facilities, programs, and assets, family readiness, GI Bill transferability, TRICARE expansion, tuition assistance, occupational licensing, rental agreement protections, and many more, which will continue to benefit National Guard servicemembers and their families for years to come.

As a U.S. Senator, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and a North Carolinian, I am pleased to congratulate Colonel Bowlin on his retirement from the North Carolina National Guard and for his impressive career of military service and steadfast commitment to our country.●

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2021.

The National Defense Authorization Act provides crucial resources for our Armed Forces and our national defense, including a pay increase for our men and women in uniform. I am glad that the Senate was able to come together on a bipartisan basis to pass this legislation to support our servicemembers, strengthen our national security, and invest in critical projects in my home State of Maryland. While there are parts of this legislation that I do not support and will seek to change in conference, I believe that, on balance, this bill serves our national interest.

In particular, I am pleased that this NDAA grants expanded acquisition authority for U.S. Cyber Command,

headquartered at Fort Meade. I echo the comments of the Armed Services Committee in its report, which finds that Cyber Command's expanded mission and responsible use of its acquisition authority justify the removal of the constraints imposed by the FY16 NDAA.

I appreciate that my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee adopted Senator WARREN's amendment directing the Pentagon to begin the process of renaming military bases named for Confederate soldiers. No American military installations should be named in honor of those who led the fight against the union to defend slavery.

I also want to note my gratitude to Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED and their staffs for working with me to include relief for the family of Lieutenant Richard W. Collins III. Lt. Collins' tragic death was made even more painful for his family through the challenges they faced in receiving the proper benefits and recognition for their son. Nothing will ever fill the void of their loss, but I am hopeful that this provision brings the Collins family some peace of mind.

Additionally, it is worth highlighting for the record that the House NDAA included a provision extending the review period of the World War I valor medals review authorized by section 584 of last year's NDAA. The Valor Medals Review Task Force has worked tirelessly to identify the service records of World War I veterans who may have been passed over for the Medal of Honor on the basis of race or ethnicity. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic has limited their access to research materials and necessitated an extension for them to complete their work. I encourage the conferees to retain the House's provision granting this extension.

While I am pleased with many of the provisions included in this bill and voted for its passage, I do have significant reservations.

I am deeply disappointed that this bill authorizes full funding for the President's misguided and wasteful nuclear weapons programs while taking no action to preserve the New START treaty, the last standing agreement capping U.S. and Russian nuclear forces. For more than half a century, successive administrations have linked arms control with nuclear modernization efforts as a way of promoting stable deterrence and heading off an unconstrained arms race. Failure to extend New START will unravel this linkage, freeing Russia of limits on its nuclear arsenal and sparking a costly, destabilizing arms buildup.

I also strongly oppose the authorization of funds to prepare for an explosive underground nuclear test, an act that would prompt our nuclear-armed adversaries to conduct their own tests and would undermine longstanding arms control and nonproliferation objectives. I applaud the House's passage of an amendment to bar nuclear test-

ing in its NDAA, and I urge my colleagues to uphold this prohibition in conference negotiations.

I also believe that this bill fails to tackle the long-term budget challenges facing our country, which is why I was disappointed that the Senate rejected Senator SANDERS' amendment to reduce defense spending by 10 percent and invest that money into healthcare, education, and poverty reduction in communities with a poverty rate of 25 percent or more. In the midst of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, a pandemic that has taken the lives of more than 150,000 of our fellow Americans and shows no signs of slowing down, and the impending crises of homelessness and joblessness that we face if the Congress fails to provide relief, we simply cannot afford to continue this level of investment in defense at the expense of other critical national priorities.

I regret that the Senate was not given an opportunity to vote on my amendment, cosponsored by 13 other Senators, prohibiting the use of U.S. security assistance to support the unilateral annexation of all or parts of the West Bank. The security assistance which the United States provides to Israel is an important element of the relationship between our two countries and one that I strongly support. As I explained in my floor statement at the time of its introduction, the amendment would not have reduced U.S. security assistance to Israel by a single penny. It would simply have ensured that no U.S. security assistance could be used for the purpose of unilaterally annexing territory in the West Bank. Furthermore, nothing in this amendment would have prohibited Israel from using U.S.-financed missile defense systems such as Iron Dome to defend against attacks in any territories that could be unilaterally annexed by the Israeli Government.

Likewise, I am troubled that the majority leader would not permit a vote on Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY's amendment to end the President's unconstitutional attacks on Americans exercising their First Amendment rights in Portland. Portland is not the first city to experience these tactics; President Trump sent unidentified Federal police onto the streets of our Nation's Capital to threaten peaceful protesters. Now, he is threatening to send them to other American cities, including Baltimore. We must require Federal agents to wear visible identification and ban them from making arrests or detentions using unmarked vehicles. The Senate's failure to act quickly to respond to the President's unconstitutional behavior is shameful.

Finally, Majority Leader MCCONNELL, at the behest of the Trump administration, once again blocked the inclusion the bipartisan DETER Act, which I introduced with Senator RUBIO, to deter future Russian interference in U.S. Federal elections. The DETER Act sends a clear message to Russian Presi-

dent Putin or any other foreign adversary: If you attack American elections, you will face severe consequences. Leader MCCONNELL blocked this measure from the last NDAA, even though the Senate had unanimously passed a resolution instructing the conferees to support its inclusion.

The decision of the Trump administration, working through Senator MCCONNELL, to continue to block the DETER Act effectively green-lights Russian interference in future U.S. elections. It is a gift to Russian President Vladimir Putin and a subversion of the clear desire expressed by both Chambers of Congress to hold Russia accountable for future interference. It reinforces Putin's belief that the costs of attacking our democracy are low and the rewards are great. I will continue fighting for the passage of the DETER Act. The Presidential election is less than 4 months away, and we must make clear to Putin that Russia will pay a steep price if they interfere in another election.

While I am opposed to some of the provisions in this bill and disappointed by the omission of others, I believe that, on balance, the NDAA will strengthen our national security and advance other important national priorities. For that reason, I voted in support of final passage.

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 No. 152, had I been present, I would have voted no on the motion to confirm Mr. Kan.

CONFIRMATION OF DEREK KAN

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I opposed the confirmation of Derek Kan to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Mr. Kan's tenure at OMB and his responses to questions from the Senate Budget Committee raise serious concerns about a lack of transparency and a failure of leadership in responding to the coronavirus pandemic.

While Mr. Kan was the Executive Associate Director at OMB, the agency illegally withheld security assistance for Ukraine in furtherance of President Trump's corrupt scheme to pressure Ukraine to interfere on President Trump's behalf in the 2020 election. On August 12, 2019, OMB General Counsel Mark Paoletta sent an email to Mr. Kan and other top OMB officials regarding concerns from the Department of Defense about this withholding, an email that made headlines when it was revealed publicly. While I specifically asked Mr. Kan about this email in written questions prior to the hearing, Mr. Kan claimed during the hearing that he was not familiar with the email in question.

The Government Accountability Office found that OMB violated the Impoundment Control Act by withholding security assistance from Ukraine, and GAO also stated that OMB's stonewalling of their inquiry had "constitutional significance" due to the undermining of legislative branch oversight. Mr. Kan, like OMB Director Russell Vought during his confirmation hearing, refused to even provide a reason for why OMB did not turn over any documents in response to GAO's request for documents to substantiate OMB's claim that a policy process was the reason for withholding aid to Ukraine. In response to my questions following the hearing, Mr. Kan referred the matter to the office of OMB General Counsel Mark Paoletta, the same official whose response to GAO's inquiry failed to turn over any such documents in the first place.

I am also concerned about Mr. Kan's leadership as a member of the President's Coronavirus Task Force. On February 5, 2020, Mr. Kan told Senators that the Trump administration did not need additional resources to address the coronavirus, which contributed to the deadly lack of preparation as the pandemic spread in the United States. During his confirmation hearing, Mr. Kan would not say whether he agreed with President Trump about reducing testing for coronavirus or whether President Trump was setting a good example by holding large indoor rallies at which masks were not required.

For those reasons, I voted against Mr. Kan's confirmation to be Deputy Director at OMB.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in 2008, Congress responded to rising reports of child sexual abuse material—CSAM—online by passing the PROTECT Act to direct the Department of Justice to combat these heinous crimes. However, in the decade that followed, DOJ failed to request the manpower, funding, and resources to combat this scourge, leaving both the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children—NCMEC—and law enforcement agencies uncoordinated, understaffed, and underfunded. As a result, though tech companies reported more than 45 million instances of CSAM to NCMEC in the last year alone, just a fraction were investigated, and even fewer were prosecuted and convicted.

Yet, rather than confronting this failure by Congress and the executive branch, my colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee have put forth the Eliminating Abusive and Rampant Neglect of Interactive Technologies—EARN IT—Act, a deeply flawed piece of legislation that would revoke online platforms' intermediary liability protections with regard to not only Federal civil law, but also any State law broadly related to CSAM.

The EARN IT Act will not protect children. It will not stop the spread of

child sexual abuse material, nor target the monsters who produce and share it, and it will not help the victims of these evil crimes. What it will do is threaten the free speech, privacy, and security of every single American. This is because, at its core, the amended EARN IT Act magnifies the failures of the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act—SESTA—and its House companion, the Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act—FOSTA. Experts believe that SESTA/FOSTA has done nothing to help victims or stop sex trafficking, while creating collateral damage for marginalized communities and the speech of all Americans. A lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of FOSTA on First Amendment grounds is proceeding through the courts, and there is bicameral Federal legislation to study the widespread negative impacts of the bill on marginalized groups.

Yet, the authors of the EARN IT Act decided to take this kind of carveout and expand it further to State civil and criminal statutes. By allowing any individual State to set laws for internet content, this bill would create massive uncertainty, both for strong encryption and constitutionally protected speech online. What is worse, the flood of State laws that could potentially arise under the EARN IT Act raises strong Fourth Amendment concerns, meaning that any CSAM evidence collected could be rendered inadmissible in court and accused CSAM offenders could get off scot-free. This is not a risk that I am willing to take.

Let me be clear: The proliferation of these heinous crimes against children is a serious problem. However, for these reasons and more, the EARN IT Act is not the solution. Moreover, it ignores what Congress can and should be doing to combat this heinous crime. The U.S. has a number of important evidence-based programs in existence that are proven to keep kids safe, and they are in desperate need of funding to do their good work. Yet the EARN IT Act doesn't include a single dollar of funding for these important programs. It is time for the U.S. Government to spend the funds necessary to save children's lives now.

In May of 2020, I introduced the Invest in Child Safety Act to do exactly that. My bill would drastically increase the number of prosecutors and agents hunting down child predators, require a single person to be personally responsible for these efforts, and direct more than \$5 billion in mandatory funding to the folks who can actually make a difference in this fight.

I believe this historic, mandatory investment in personnel and funding is necessary to truly take on the scourge of child exploitation, and I urge my colleagues to support my approach. Meanwhile, I intend to object to any unanimous consent agreement regarding the EARN IT Act.

REMEMBERING COLONEL RONALD DUDLEY RAY

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, Col. Ronald Dudley Ray, USMC, served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Guard/Reserve) during the Reagan administration and was a highly decorated Vietnam veteran who was an adviser to the South Vietnamese Marine Corps during the Tet Offensive and other campaigns. He was awarded two Silver Stars, a Bronze Star with combat V, and a Purple Heart. His gallantry under fire was exceeded only by his tenacious advocacy for his fellow veterans. He entered law school at the University of Louisville, where he graduated at the top of his class. Throughout his civilian career, he used his talent and professional skills to encourage, organize, and recognize veterans from the Vietnam era. He personally championed the Kentucky Vietnam Veterans' Memorial in Frankfort, and led the way in raising \$1 million for its design and construction. A great student of American history, he amassed a collection of over 10,000 books on the subject, and he shared his vast knowledge by writing and speaking about the history of the country he loved and served with such distinction. Colonel Ray, who passed away July 6, 2020, leaves a unique legacy of personal service to our Nation and dedication to its veterans that is worthy of this special distinction.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CYNTHIA BARRETT

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Cynthia Barrett, the Highlands County Teacher of the Year from Avon Park High School in Avon Park, FL.

Cynthia believes teaching is more than just a job. She holds her students to high expectations, knowing they are in advanced classes and will soon become leaders throughout their communities. Cynthia appreciates this award is more than just a recognition of her hard work, but also an acknowledgment of the hard work her students put in each day.

Cynthia teaches AP world history and economics/honors at Avon Park High School. She has taught in Highlands County since 1994 and previously taught in Leon County from 1989 to 1994. Cynthia is a graduate of Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University.

I offer my sincere gratitude to Cynthia on her dedication to teaching students throughout the school year. I look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH CAMP

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Elizabeth Camp, the Sumter County Teacher of the Year from Wildwood Elementary School in Wildwood, FL.

Elizabeth believes that teachers hold several roles in the lives of their students. For example, they are responsible for imparting knowledge, as well as providing guidance and leadership related to many of life's skills. She often considers teachers to be surrogate family members for their students.

Elizabeth's philosophy for teaching is one that states all students can learn and grow, no matter their background. She embodies the principle that having enthusiasm for learning is required to propel students, as well as others in the learning community, and makes for a more positive educational environment.

Elizabeth teaches fifth grade math and science at Wildwood Elementary School and has been a teacher for 21 years. She graduated from the University of Central Florida with a bachelor's degree in elementary education.

I extend my best wishes to Elizabeth on the decades she has devoted to teaching her students. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER DIXON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jennifer Dixon, the Pasco County Teacher of the Year from Gulf High School in New Port Richey, FL.

Jennifer is excited to come to work every day because of her students. She finds it a great honor to work with them, to understand them, to teach them, and to help them grow throughout the school year.

High school was not Jennifer's favorite time in her life, and she believes other students should not have a similar experience. She credits teachers she had throughout her educational career for making a difference, helping her to become the first person in her family to graduate from college.

Jennifer teaches economics, financial literacy, and psychology at Gulf High School. She became a teacher in 2003 and is certified to teach art K-12, exceptional student education K-12, business education for grades 6-12, and social studies for grades 6-12. She received her master's degree in education from Eastern New Mexico University and is currently pursuing a doctorate degree in educational leadership policy from Texas Tech University.

I extend my best wishes to Jennifer and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO DIANA O'CONNOR

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Diana O'Connor, the Indian River County Teacher of the Year from Beachland Elementary School in Vero Beach, FL.

Diana instills her love for learning in each student, knowing this is important for them today and later in their academic careers. Diana began a schoolwide initiative for collecting

soda can tabs for Ronald McDonald House Charities and is one of the lead representatives for her school's Leukemia and Lymphoma Society's Pennies for Patients program. She brings awareness of these issues to her students to assist their classmates who may be in need of help without their classmates knowing about it.

Diana is the exceptional student education department chair and assists general education teachers in planning standards-based instruction and diverse lesson plans at Beachland Elementary School. She is also an ESOL endorsed educator. Diana graduated cum laude from the University of Central Florida with a bachelor's degree in specific learning disabilities for kindergarten through twelfth grade and is currently working towards her reading endorsement. Diana is a certified crisis prevention and intervention educator, a clinical educator, and an Indian River County Education Association member.

I offer my sincere gratitude to Diana for helping students learn throughout the school year. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTINE O'HARA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Christine O'Hara, the Charlotte County Teacher of the Year from Peace River Elementary School in Charlotte Harbor, FL.

Christine enjoys sharing her passion for math with teachers and students and believes everyone is a math person at heart. She enjoys utilizing the learning experience to make math enjoyable and successful for her students.

In 2016 and 2017, Christine was identified as a High Impact Teacher by the Florida Department of Education. Her fourth grade students' growth on State testing was among the most positive in the State.

Christine is a math coach at Peace River Elementary School, teaching in Florida for 13 years, with 6 of them in Charlotte County. Last year, she became an instructional math coach and is a member of the District Elementary Math Framework committee. She graduated from Central Michigan University in 2005. Outside of her classroom, Christine teaches group fitness classes and enjoys fishing in Charlotte Harbor with her fiancé, Travis.

I congratulate Christine on her hard work for her students over the years. I extend my best wishes and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO JESSICA PRICE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Jessica Price, the Citrus County Teacher of the Year from Lecanto High School in Lecanto, FL.

Although she never planned to become a Spanish teacher, Jessica's pas-

sion for sharing a love for language makes her an excellent educator. Jessica loved learning as a student in Citrus County, focusing on Spanish and chorus as her favorite classes. She had originally planned to become a music teacher, but Spanish captivated her to teach the language to students each year. In college, she studied in Mexico, living with a family and immersing herself in Spanish culture, furthering her love of the Spanish language.

Jessica teaches Spanish at Lecanto High School and has been a teacher since 2011. She majored in Spanish and English, with minors in linguistics and teaching English as a second language from the University of Florida. Jessica also oversees her school's honor society.

I extend my best wishes to Jessica and look forward to learning of her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KATRINA RODDENBERRY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Katrina Roddenberry, the Wakulla County Teacher of the Year from Wakulla Middle School in Crawfordville, FL.

Katrina finds it incredibly rewarding to see students motivated by science experiments and researching on their own about careers in science fields. She strives to spark their interests, which helped to raise Wakulla Middle School's average science proficiency on the Florida Science Assessment for eighth grade by 23 percent, which is 21 percent above the State average.

Katrina created and sponsors her school's science, technology, engineering, and math club, is an Odyssey of the Mind coach, Fellowship of Christian Athletes cosponsor, and is a teacher coach. She believes the ultimate measure of her success as a science teacher is when her students leave her classroom with strong foundational knowledge of science concepts and a renewed curiosity and love of learning about the world around them.

Katrina is in her third year of teaching middle school science and high school credit integrated science and integrated science honors to eighth graders at Wakulla Middle School. Previously, she taught third and fifth grade at Riversink Elementary School and is in her 12th year of teaching. She received her bachelor's degree in elementary education from Flagler College, earned certifications in exceptional student education, middle grades integrated, and general science for sixth through ninth grades. She received her master's degree from American College of Education in curriculum and instruction with a concentration in teaching science and is an adjunct professor at Flagler College in Tallahassee. Katrina is also a NASA Space Foundation Teacher Liaison, is on the Space Educators Expedition Crew, and is a member of the National

Science Teachers Association and the Florida Association of Science Teachers.

I offer my sincere gratitude to Katrina for her years of hard work. I look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DEVAN ROULHAC

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Devan Roulhac, the Calhoun County Teacher of the Year from Blountstown High School in Blountstown, FL.

Devan's inspiration as an educator is to learn more about his students. He does this because we typically do not know the realities some students endure after leaving the classroom or how deeply those negative experiences affect their mental health and personal well-being. His inspiration comes from his own personal experience as a student.

Devan knows some students have it worse than what he experienced and has realized the students he teaches today mimic the same front he put on while in school. This thought process is what drives his every decision to help those students who need it the most.

Devan is an English I teacher at Blountstown High School. He began his teaching career in 2017 teaching English and reading at Wewahitchka Jr./Sr. High School. Currently, Devan is developing a curriculum for teaching freshman English courses that meet Florida standards, focusing on informational text analyses, argumentative writing, and grammar mechanics.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Devan for his commitment to teaching and making a difference in the lives of his students. I look forward to hearing of his good work in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JERRY WEBB

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Jerry Webb, the Taylor County Teacher of the Year from Taylor County Elementary School in Perry, FL.

Jerry dedicates himself as an educator by putting his students first. He tutors them on subjects they are struggling with and makes himself available to talk about anything they need to discuss. Jerry works to make a difference in the lives of his students in any way that he can.

Superintendent, Dr. Danny Glover, Jr., notes Jerry's innovative teaching style is something not easily replicated and is a part of the reason he won this important award. Dr. Glover noted how fortunate the Taylor County School District is to have Jerry.

Jerry has taught fourth and fifth grades at Taylor County Elementary School for the past 6 years. Previously, he worked as a paraprofessional at the school before becoming a grade school teacher.

I extend my best wishes to Jerry and look forward to hearing of his continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CARRIE WILSON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Carrie Wilson, the Hernando County Teacher of the Year from Challenger K-8 School of Science and Mathematics in Spring Hill, FL.

Carrie wants students to feel their school is like their home and to know they are cared for and valued when coming to class. She is very grateful to receive this important recognition as it represents the many passionate professionals who work in the Hernando County School District.

Carrie has been a school counselor since 2001 and is in her 21st year working in elementary education. She is a graduate of the University of South Florida and earned her graduate degree in counseling and psychology from Troy State. She works to raise awareness to students' mental health and encourages others to see themselves as a partner in helping those who need that support.

I offer my sincere gratitude to Carrie for her more than two decades of helping students. I look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO HEATHER YOUNG

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Heather Young, the Sarasota County Teacher of the Year from Venice Elementary School in Venice, FL.

Heather has been a teacher for 22 years and is in her first year of teaching visual arts at Venice Elementary School. Previously, she taught gifted students in elementary school through middle school in Sarasota County Schools.

Heather makes her art room a great venue for teaching her students, whether they are gifted or intellectually disabled. She uses art to teach innovative ways to facilitate problem-solving, risk-taking, and creative decisionmaking skills.

Heather believes there is no better way to spend her day than having a classroom that is a creative outlet for students. She tries to get them to stop questioning whether they can do something and, instead, empowers them to be creative on their own.

I offer my sincere gratitude to Heather for the good work she does for her students. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United

States submitting sundry withdrawals which were laid on the table.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7512. An act to rename the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards as the House Communications Standards Commission, to extend the authority of the Commission to regulate mass mailings of Members and Members-elect of the House of Representatives to all unsolicited mass communications of Members and Members-elect of the House, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Michael M. Lynton as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Women in Congress, 1917-2006".

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Finance, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. 4323. A bill to save and strengthen critical social contract programs of the Federal Government.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on Finance.

*Alina I. Marshall, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Christian N. Weiler, of Louisiana, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Michael N. Nemelka, of Utah, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Investment, Services, Labor, Environment, Africa, China, and the Western Hemisphere), with the rank of Ambassador.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. MERKLEY:

S. 4396. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to support schools of nursing in program enhancement and infrastructure modernization, increasing the number of nursing faculty and students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4397. A bill to provide for research and education with respect to uterine fibroids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 4398. A bill to provide compensation to certain residents of the island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, for the use of such island for military readiness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. 4399. A bill to create a database of eviction information, establish grant programs for eviction prevention and legal aid, and limit use of housing court-related records in consumer reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 4400. A bill to regulate the collection, retention, disclosure, and destruction of biometric information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 4401. A bill to restore, reaffirm, and reconcile environmental justice and civil rights, provide for the establishment of the Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice Compliance and Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4402. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify certain activities that would have been authorized under Nationwide Permit 12 and other Nationwide Permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4403. A bill to amend the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003 to include California in the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4404. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Butterfield Overland National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 4405. A bill to establish a pilot program to provide grants to nongovernmental entities, including nonprofit organizations and faith-based organizations, to provide economic support in urban areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 26

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 26, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections, to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for automatic voter registration.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1267

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) 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. 2061

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2061, a bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2346

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2346, a bill to improve the Fishery Resource Disaster Relief program of the National Marine Fisheries Service, and for other purposes.

S. 2733

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2733, a bill to save and strengthen critical social contract programs of the Federal Government.

S. 2886

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2886, a bill to prohibit the use of animal testing for cosmetics and the sale of cosmetics tested on animals.

S. 3424

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3424, a bill to end preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States and close disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes.

S. 3471

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3471, a bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

S. 3620

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3620, a bill to establish a Housing Assistance Fund at the Department of the Treasury.

S. 3672

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3672, a bill to provide States and Indian Tribes with flexibility in administering the temporary assistance for needy families program due to the public health emergency with respect to the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19), to make emergency grants to States and Indian Tribes to provide financial support for low-income individuals affected by that public health emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 3685

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3685, a bill to provide emergency rental assistance under the Emergency Solutions Grants program of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in response to the public health emergency resulting from the coronavirus, and for other purposes.

S. 3718

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3718, a bill to expand the waiver of affiliation rules for certain business concerns with more than 1 physical location, and for other purposes.

S. 3814

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors 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. 3899

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms.

SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3899, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a retraining assistance program for unemployed veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3963

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3963, a bill to protect certain whistleblowers seeking to ensure accountability and oversight of the Nation's COVID-19 pandemic response, and for other purposes.

S. 4012

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4012, a bill to establish a \$120,000,000,000 Restaurant Revitalization Fund to provide structured relief to food service or drinking establishments through December 31, 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 4048

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4048, a bill to modify the deadlines for completing the 2020 decennial census of population and related tabulations, and for other purposes.

S. 4071

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4071, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to adjust identification number requirements for taxpayers filing joint returns to receive Economic Impact Payments.

S. 4075

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor 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. 4098

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4098, a bill to provide funding for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4117

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4117, a bill to provide automatic forgiveness for paycheck protection program loans under \$150,000, and for other purposes.

S. 4150

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors 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. 4154

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4154, a bill to amend the Bank Service Company Act to provide improvements with respect to State banking agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 4172

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4172, a bill to provide emergency funding for child welfare services provided under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4217

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4217, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to include hospitals serving rural areas or areas of persistent poverty in the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes.

S. 4233

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4233, a bill to establish a payment program for unexpected loss of markets and revenues to timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 4284

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4284, a bill to provide for emergency education freedom grants, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 4295

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) 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. 4310

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) 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 North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) 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. 4323

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4323, a bill to save and strengthen critical social contract programs of the Federal Government.

S. 4362

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4362, a bill to prohibit water and power shutoffs during the COVID-19 emergency period, provide drinking and waste water assistance to households, and for other purposes.

S. 4379

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4379, a bill to extend the period of the temporary authority to extend contracts and leases under the ARMS Initiative.

S. 4388

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4388, a bill to address mental health issues for youth, particularly youth of color, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 658

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 658, a resolution calling for a free, fair, and transparent presidential election in Belarus taking place on August 9, 2020, including the unimpeded participation of all presidential candidates.

S. RES. 663

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 663, a resolution supporting mask-wearing as an important measure to limit the spread of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19).

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2503. Mrs. LOEFFLER (for herself, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2499 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2504. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2499 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2503. Mrs. LOEFFLER (for herself, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2499 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. TAX INCENTIVES FOR RELOCATING MANUFACTURING OF PHARMACEUTICALS AND MEDICAL SUPPLIES AND DEVICES TO THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY.**—Section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(n) **ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY ACQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH THE RELOCATION OF MANUFACTURING OF PHARMACEUTICALS AND MEDICAL SUPPLIES AND DEVICES TO THE UNITED STATES.**—

“(1) **TREATMENT AS 20-YEAR PROPERTY.**—For purposes of this section, qualified nonresidential real property shall be treated as 20-year property.

“(2) **APPLICATION OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.**—For application of bonus depreciation to qualified nonresidential real property, see subsection (k).

“(3) **QUALIFIED NONRESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified nonresidential real property’ means nonresidential real property placed in service in the United States by a qualified manufacturer if such property is acquired by such qualified manufacturer in connection with a qualified relocation of manufacturing.

“(4) **QUALIFIED MANUFACTURER.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified manufacturer’ means any person engaged in the trade or business of manufacturing a qualified medical product.

“(5) **QUALIFIED MEDICAL PRODUCT.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified medical product’ means any pharmaceutical, medical device, or medical supply.

“(6) **QUALIFIED RELOCATION OF MANUFACTURING.**—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified relocation of manufacturing’ means, with respect to any qualified manufacturer, the relocation of the manufacturing of a qualified medical product from a foreign country to the United States.

“(B) **RELOCATION OF PROPERTY NOT REQUIRED.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), manufacturing shall not fail to be treated as relocated merely because property used in such manufacturing was not relocated.

“(C) **RELOCATION OF NOT LESS THAN EQUIVALENT PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY REQUIRED.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), manufacturing shall not be treated as relocated unless the property manufactured in the United States is substantially identical to the property

previously manufactured in a foreign country and the increase in the units of production of such property in the United States by the qualified manufacturer is not less than the reduction in the units of production of such property in such foreign country by such qualified manufacturer.

“(7) **APPLICATION TO POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘United States’ includes any possession of the United States.”

(b) **EXCLUSION OF GAIN ON DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY IN CONNECTION WITH QUALIFIED RELOCATION OF MANUFACTURING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after section 139H the following new section:

“SEC. 139I. EXCLUSION OF GAIN ON DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY IN CONNECTION WITH QUALIFIED RELOCATION OF MANUFACTURING.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a qualified manufacturer, gross income shall not include gain from the sale or exchange of qualified relocation disposition property.

“(b) **QUALIFIED RELOCATION DISPOSITION PROPERTY.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified relocation disposition property’ means any property which—

“(1) is sold or exchanged by a qualified manufacturer in connection with a qualified relocation of manufacturing, and

“(2) was used by such qualified manufacturer in the trade or business of manufacturing a qualified medical product in the foreign country from which such manufacturing is being relocated.

“(c) **OTHER TERMS.**—Terms used in this section which are also used in subsection (n) of section 168 shall have the same meaning when used in this section as when used in such subsection.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 139H the following new item:

“Sec. 139I. Exclusion of gain on disposition of property in connection with qualified relocation of manufacturing.”

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—

(1) **ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **EXCLUSION OF GAIN.**—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to sales and exchanges after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2504. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2499 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL 2020 RECOVERY REBATES FOR INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter B of chapter 65 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 6428 the following new section:

“SEC. 6428A. ADDITIONAL 2020 RECOVERY REBATES FOR INDIVIDUALS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to the credit allowed under section 6428, in the case of an eligible individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by subtitle

A for the first taxable year beginning in 2020 an amount equal to the sum of—

“(1) \$1,200 (\$2,400 in the case of eligible individuals filing a joint return), plus

“(2) an amount equal to the product of \$500 multiplied by the number of dependents (as defined in section 152(a)) of the taxpayer.

“(b) **TREATMENT OF CREDIT.**—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall be treated as allowed by subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1.

“(c) **LIMITATION BASED ON ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.**—The amount of the credit allowed by subsection (a) (determined without regard to this subsection and subsection (e)) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by 5 percent of so much of the taxpayer’s adjusted gross income as exceeds—

“(1) \$150,000 in the case of a joint return,

“(2) \$112,500 in the case of a head of household, and

“(3) \$75,000 in the case of a taxpayer not described in paragraph (1) or (2).

“(d) **ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible individual’ means any individual who is not described in paragraph (2) and who was not deceased prior to January 1, 2020.

“(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—An individual is described in this paragraph if such individual is—

“(A) a nonresident alien individual,

“(B) an individual with respect to whom a deduction under section 151 is allowable to another taxpayer for a taxable year beginning in the calendar year in which the individual’s taxable year begins, or

“(C) an estate or trust.

“(e) **COORDINATION WITH ADVANCE REFUNDS OF CREDIT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount of credit which would (but for this paragraph) be allowable under this section shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the aggregate refunds and credits made or allowed to the taxpayer under subsection (f). Any failure to so reduce the credit shall be treated as arising out of a mathematical or clerical error and assessed according to section 6213(b)(1).

“(2) **JOINT RETURNS.**—In the case of a refund or credit made or allowed under subsection (f) with respect to a joint return, half of such refund or credit shall be treated as having been made or allowed to each individual filing such return.

“(f) **ADVANCE REFUNDS AND CREDITS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (5), each individual who was an eligible individual for such individual’s first taxable year beginning in 2019 shall be treated as having made a payment against the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year in an amount equal to the advance refund amount for such taxable year.

“(2) **ADVANCE REFUND AMOUNT.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the advance refund amount is the amount that would have been allowed as a credit under this section for such taxable year if this section (other than subsection (e) and this subsection) had applied to such taxable year.

“(3) **TIMING AND MANNER OF PAYMENTS.**—

“(A) **TIMING.**—The Secretary shall, subject to the provisions of this title, refund or credit any overpayment attributable to this section as rapidly as possible. No refund or credit shall be made or allowed under this subsection after December 31, 2020.

“(B) **DELIVERY OF PAYMENTS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may certify and disburse refunds payable under this subsection electronically to—

“(i) any account to which the payee received or authorized, on or after January 1, 2018, a refund of taxes under this title or of

a Federal payment (as defined in section 3332 of title 31, United States Code),

“(ii) any account belonging to a payee from which that individual, on or after January 1, 2018, made a payment of taxes under this title, or

“(iii) any Treasury-sponsored account (as defined in section 208.2 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations).

“(C) WAIVER OF CERTAIN RULES.—Notwithstanding section 3325 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, with respect to any payment of a refund under this subsection, a disbursing official in the executive branch of the United States Government may modify payment information received from an officer or employee described in section 3325(a)(1)(B) of such title for the purpose of facilitating the accurate and efficient delivery of such payment. Except in cases of fraud or reckless neglect, no liability under sections 3325, 3527, 3528, or 3529 of title 31, United States Code, shall be imposed with respect to payments made under this subparagraph.

“(4) NO INTEREST.—No interest shall be allowed on any overpayment attributable to this section.

“(5) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS WHO DO NOT FILE A RETURN OF TAX FOR 2019.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who, at the time of any determination made pursuant to paragraph (3), has not filed a tax return for the year described in paragraph (1), the Secretary may—

“(i) apply such paragraph by substituting ‘2018’ for ‘2019’.

“(ii) use information with respect to such individual for calendar year 2019 provided in—

“(I) Form SSA-1099, Social Security Benefit Statement, or

“(II) Form RRB-1099, Social Security Equivalent Benefit Statement, or

“(iii) use information with respect to such individual which is provided by—

“(I) in the case of a specified social security beneficiary or a specified supplemental security income recipient, the Commissioner of Social Security,

“(II) in the case of a specified railroad retirement beneficiary, the Railroad Retirement Board, and

“(III) in the case of a specified veterans beneficiary, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (in coordination with, and with the assistance of, the Commissioner of Social Security if appropriate).

“(B) SPECIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘specified individual’ means any individual who is—

“(i) a specified social security beneficiary,

“(ii) a specified supplemental security income recipient,

“(iii) a specified railroad retirement beneficiary, or

“(iv) a specified veterans beneficiary.

“(C) SPECIFIED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘specified social security beneficiary’ means any individual who, for the last month that ends prior to the date of enactment of this section, is entitled to any monthly insurance benefit payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), including payments made pursuant to sections 202(d), 223(g), and 223(i)(7) of such Act.

“(D) SPECIFIED SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME RECIPIENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘specified supplemental security income recipient’ means any individual who, for the last month that ends prior to the date of enactment of this section, is eligible for a monthly benefit payable under title XVI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) (other than a benefit to an individual described in section

1611(e)(1)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382(e)(1)(B)), including—

“(i) payments made pursuant to section 1614(a)(3)(C) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382c(a)(3)(C)),

“(ii) payments made pursuant to section 1619(a) (42 U.S.C. 1382h(a)) or subsections (a)(4), (a)(7), or (p)(7) of section 1631 (42 U.S.C. 1383) of such Act, and

“(iii) State supplementary payments of the type referred to in section 1616(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382e(a)) (or payments of the type described in section 212(a) of Public Law 93-66) which are paid by the Commissioner under an agreement referred to in such section 1616(a) (or section 212(a) of Public Law 93-66).

“(E) SPECIFIED RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFICIARY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘specified railroad retirement beneficiary’ means any individual who, for the last month that ends prior to the date of enactment of this section, is entitled to a monthly annuity or pension payment payable (without regard to section 5(a)(ii) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231d(a)(ii))) under—

“(i) section 2(a)(1) of such Act (45 U.S.C. 231a(a)(1)),

“(ii) section 2(c) of such Act (45 U.S.C. 231a(c)),

“(iii) section 2(d)(1) of such Act (45 U.S.C. 231a(d)(1)), or

“(iv) section 7(b)(2) of such Act (45 U.S.C. 231f(b)(2)) with respect to any of the benefit payments described in subparagraph (C).

“(F) SPECIFIED VETERANS BENEFICIARY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘specified veterans beneficiary’ means any individual who, for the last month that ends prior to the date of enactment of this section, is entitled to a compensation or pension payment payable under—

“(i) section 1110, 1117, 1121, 1131, 1141, or 1151 of title 38, United States Code,

“(ii) section 1310, 1312, 1313, 1315, 1316, or 1318 of title 38, United States Code,

“(iii) section 1513, 1521, 1533, 1536, 1537, 1541, 1542, or 1562 of title 38, United States Code, or

“(iv) section 1805, 1815, or 1821 of title 38, United States Code, to a veteran, surviving spouse, child, or parent as described in paragraph (2), (3), (4)(A)(ii), or (5) of section 101, title 38, United States Code.

“(G) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATIONS AND REDETERMINATIONS NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—For purposes of this section, any individual’s status as a specified social security beneficiary, a specified supplemental security income recipient, a specified railroad retirement beneficiary, or a specified veterans beneficiary shall be unaffected by any determination or redetermination of any entitlement to, or eligibility for, any benefit, payment, or compensation, if such determination or redetermination occurs after the last month that ends prior to the date of enactment of this section.

“(H) PAYMENT TO REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES AND FIDUCIARIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the benefit, payment, or compensation referred to in subparagraph (C), (D), (E), or (F) with respect to any specified individual is paid to a representative payee or fiduciary, payment by the Secretary under paragraph (3) with respect to such specified individual shall be made to such individual’s representative payee or fiduciary and the entire payment shall be used only for the benefit of the individual who is entitled to the payment.

“(ii) APPLICATION OF ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.—

“(I) IN THE CASE OF A PAYMENT DESCRIBED IN clause (i) which is made with respect to a specified social security beneficiary or a

specified supplemental security income recipient, section 1129(a)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-8(a)(3)) shall apply to such payment in the same manner as such section applies to a payment under title II or XVI of such Act.

“(II) IN THE CASE OF A PAYMENT DESCRIBED IN clause (i) which is made with respect to a specified railroad retirement beneficiary, section 13 of the Railroad Retirement Act (45 U.S.C. 2311) shall apply to such payment in the same manner as such section applies to a payment under such Act.

“(III) IN THE CASE OF A PAYMENT DESCRIBED IN clause (i) which is made with respect to a specified veterans beneficiary, sections 5502, 6106, and 6108 of title 38, United States Code, shall apply to such payment in the same manner as such sections apply to a payment under such title.

“(6) NOTICE TO INDIVIDUALS.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the Secretary distributed any payment to an eligible individual pursuant to this subsection, notice shall be sent by mail to such individual’s last known address. Such notice shall indicate the method by which such payment was made, the amount of such payment, and a phone number for the appropriate point of contact at the Internal Revenue Service to report any failure to receive such payment.

“(g) IDENTIFICATION NUMBER REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) to an eligible individual who does not include on the return of tax for the taxable year—

“(A) such individual’s valid identification number,

“(B) in the case of a joint return, the valid identification number of such individual’s spouse, and

“(C) in the case of any dependent taken into account under subsection (a)(2), the valid identification number of such dependent.

“(2) VALID IDENTIFICATION NUMBER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘valid identification number’ means a social security number (as such term is defined in section 24(h)(7)).

“(B) ADOPTION TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(C), in the case of a dependent who is adopted or placed for adoption, the term ‘valid identification number’ shall include the adoption taxpayer identification number of such dependent.

“(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply in the case where at least 1 spouse was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States at any time during the taxable year and at least 1 spouse satisfies paragraph (1)(A).

“(4) MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR AUTHORITY.—Any omission of a correct valid identification number required under this subsection shall be treated as a mathematical or clerical error for purposes of applying section 6213(g)(2) to such omission.

“(h) SPECIAL RULES WITH RESPECT TO PRISONERS.—

“(1) DISALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), no credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) to an eligible individual who is, for each day during calendar year 2020, described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of section 202(x)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(x)(1)(A)).

“(B) JOINT RETURN.—In the case of eligible individuals filing a joint return where 1 spouse is described in subparagraph (A), subsection (a)(1) shall be applied by substituting ‘\$1,200’ for ‘\$2,400’.

“(2) DENIAL OF ADVANCE REFUND OR CREDIT.—No refund or credit shall be made or allowed under subsection (f) with respect to any individual whom the Secretary has knowledge is, at the time of any determination made pursuant to paragraph (3) of such subsection, described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of section 202(x)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act.

“(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including any such measures as are deemed appropriate to avoid allowing multiple credits or rebates to a taxpayer.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF DEFICIENCY.—Section 6211(b)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and 6428” and inserting “6428, and 6428A”.

(c) TREATMENT OF POSSESSIONS.—Rules similar to the rules of subsection (c) of section 2201 of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) shall apply for purposes of this section.

(d) EXCEPTION FROM REDUCTION OR OFFSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any credit or refund allowed or made to any individual by reason of section 6428A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) or by reason of subsection (c) of this section shall not be—

(A) subject to reduction or offset pursuant to section 3716 or 3720A of title 31, United States Code,

(B) subject to reduction or offset pursuant to subsection (d), (e), or (f) of section 6402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(C) reduced or offset by other assessed Federal taxes that would otherwise be subject to levy or collection.

(2) ASSIGNMENT OF BENEFITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The right of any person to any applicable payment shall not be transferable or assignable, at law or in equity, and no applicable payment shall be subject to, execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process, or the operation of any bankruptcy or insolvency law.

(B) ENCODING OF PAYMENTS.—In the case of an applicable payment described in subparagraph (D)(iii)(I) that is paid electronically by direct deposit through the Automated Clearing House (ACH) network, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall—

(i) issue the payment using a unique identifier that is reasonably sufficient to allow a financial institution to identify the payment as an applicable payment, and

(ii) further encode the payment pursuant to the same specifications as required for a benefit payment defined in section 212.3 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(C) GARNISHMENT.—

(i) ENCODED PAYMENTS.—In the case of a garnishment order that applies to an account that has received an applicable payment that is encoded as provided in subparagraph (B), a financial institution shall follow the requirements and procedures set forth in part 212 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, except a financial institution shall not, with regard to any applicable payment, be required to provide the notice referenced in sections 212.6 and 212.7 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations. This paragraph shall not alter the status of applicable payments as tax refunds or other nonbenefit payments for purpose of any reclamation rights of the Department of the Treasury or the Internal Revenue Service as per part 210 of title 31 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

(ii) OTHER PAYMENTS.—If a financial institution receives a garnishment order, other than an order that has been served by the United States or an order that has been served by a Federal, State, or local child support enforcement agency, that has been re-

ceived by a financial institution and that applies to an account into which an applicable payment that has not been encoded as provided in subparagraph (B) has been deposited electronically or by an applicable payment that has been deposited by check on any date in the lookback period, the financial institution, upon the request of the account holder, shall treat the amount of the funds in the account at the time of the request, up to the amount of the applicable payment (in addition to any amounts otherwise protected under part 212 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations), as exempt from a garnishment order without requiring the consent of the party serving the garnishment order or the judgment creditor.

(iii) LIABILITY.—A financial institution that acts in good faith in reliance on clauses (i) or (ii) shall not be subject to liability or regulatory action under any Federal or State law, regulation, court or other order, or regulatory interpretation for actions concerning any applicable payments.

(D) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

(i) ACCOUNT HOLDER.—The term “account holder” means a natural person whose name appears in a financial institution's records as the direct or beneficial owner of an account.

(ii) ACCOUNT REVIEW.—The term “account review” means the process of examining deposits in an account to determine if an applicable payment has been deposited into the account during the lookback period. The financial institution shall perform the account review following the procedures outlined in section 212.5 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations and in accordance with the requirements of section 212.6 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(iii) APPLICABLE PAYMENT.—The term “applicable payment” means—

(I) any advance refund amount paid pursuant to subsection (f) of section 6428A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as so added),

(II) any payment made by a possession of the United States with a mirror code tax system (as defined in subsection (c) of section 2201 of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) pursuant to such subsection which corresponds to a payment described in subclause (I), and

(III) any payment made by a possession of the United States without a mirror code tax system (as so defined) pursuant to section 2201(c) of such Act.

(iv) GARNISHMENT.—The term “garnishment” means execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

(v) GARNISHMENT ORDER.—The term “garnishment order” means a writ, order, notice, summons, judgment, levy, or similar written instruction issued by a court, a State or State agency, a municipality or municipal corporation, or a State child support enforcement agency, including a lien arising by operation of law for overdue child support or an order to freeze the assets in an account, to effect a garnishment against a debtor.

(vi) LOOKBACK PERIOD.—The term “lookback period” means the two month period that begins on the date preceding the date of account review and ends on the corresponding date of the month two months earlier, or on the last date of the month two months earlier if the corresponding date does not exist.

(e) PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall conduct a public awareness campaign, in coordination with the Commissioner of Social Security and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, to provide information regarding the availability of the credit and rebate allowed under section 6428A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section), including informa-

tion with respect to individuals who may not have filed a tax return for taxable year 2018 or 2019.

(f) APPROPRIATIONS TO CARRY OUT REBATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Immediately upon the enactment of this Act, the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020:

(A) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.—

(i) For an additional amount for “Department of the Treasury—Internal Revenue Service—Taxpayer Services”, \$29,027,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021.

(ii) For an additional amount for “Department of the Treasury—Internal Revenue Service—Operations Support”, \$236,548,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021.

(iii) For an additional amount for “Department of the Treasury—Internal Revenue Service—Enforcement”, \$54,425,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021.

Amounts made available in appropriations under this subparagraph may be transferred between such appropriations upon the advance notification of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Such transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority provided by law.

(B) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.—For an additional amount for “Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses”, \$38,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021.

(2) REPORTS.—No later than 15 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the expected use of the funds provided by paragraph (1)(A). Beginning 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a quarterly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the actual expenditure of funds provided by paragraph (1)(A) and the expected expenditure of such funds in the subsequent quarter.

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 1324(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting “6428A.” after “6428.”.

(2) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 6428 the following:

“Sec. 6428A. Additional 2020 Recovery Rebates for individuals.”.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATIONS TO RECOVERY REBATES MADE UNDER THE CARES ACT.

(a) PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO DECEASED INDIVIDUALS.—Subsection (d) of section 6428 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(d) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible individual’ means any individual who is not described in paragraph (2) and who was not deceased prior to January 1, 2020.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—An individual is described in this paragraph if such individual is—

“(A) a nonresident alien individual,

“(B) an individual with respect to whom a deduction under section 151 is allowable to another taxpayer for a taxable year beginning in the calendar year in which the individual's taxable year begins, or

“(C) an estate or trust.”.

(b) PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO PRISONERS.—Section 6428 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i), and

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

“(h) SPECIAL RULES WITH RESPECT TO PRISONERS.—

“(1) DISALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), no credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) to an eligible individual who, for each day during calendar year 2020, is described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of section 202(x)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(x)(1)(A)).

“(B) JOINT RETURN.—In the case of eligible individuals filing a joint return where 1 spouse is described in subparagraph (A), subsection (a)(1) shall be applied by substituting ‘\$1,200’ for ‘\$2,400’.

“(2) DENIAL OF ADVANCE REFUND OR CREDIT.—No refund or credit shall be made or allowed under subsection (f) with respect to any individual whom the Secretary has knowledge is, at the time of any determination made pursuant to paragraph (3) of such subsection, described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of section 202(x)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act.”

(c) PROTECTION OF RECOVERY REBATES.—Subsection (d) of section 2201 of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), and by moving such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right,

(2) by striking “REDUCTION OR OFFSET.—Any credit” and inserting “REDUCTION, OFFSET, GARNISHMENT, ETC.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any credit”, and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) ASSIGNMENT OF BENEFITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The right of any person to any applicable payment shall not be transferable or assignable, at law or in equity, and no applicable payment shall be subject to, execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process, or the operation of any bankruptcy or insolvency law.

“(B) ENCODING OF PAYMENTS.—As soon as practicable, but not earlier than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, in the case of an applicable payment described in subparagraph (D)(iii)(I) that is paid electronically by direct deposit through the Automated Clearing House (ACH) network, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall—

“(i) issue the payment using a unique identifier that is reasonably sufficient to allow a financial institution to identify the payment as an applicable payment, and

“(ii) further encode the payment pursuant to the same specifications as required for a benefit payment defined in section 212.3 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(C) GARNISHMENT.—

“(i) ENCODED PAYMENTS.—In the case of a garnishment order received after the date that is 10 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph and that applies to an account that has received an applicable payment that is encoded as provided in subparagraph (B), a financial institution shall follow the requirements and procedures set forth in part 212 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, except a financial institution shall not, with regard to any applicable payment, be required to provide the notice referenced in sections 212.6 and 212.7 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations. This paragraph shall not alter the status of applicable payments as tax refunds or other nonbenefit payments for purpose of any reclamation rights of the Department of the Treasury or the Internal Revenue Service as per part 210 of title 31 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

“(ii) OTHER PAYMENTS.—If a financial institution receives a garnishment order, other than an order that has been served by the

United States or an order that has been served by a Federal, State, or local child support enforcement agency, that has been received by a financial institution after the date that is 10 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph and that applies to an account into which an applicable payment that has not been encoded as provided in subparagraph (B) has been deposited electronically or by an applicable payment that has been deposited by check on any date in the lookback period, the financial institution, upon the request of the account holder, shall treat the amount of the funds in the account at the time of the request, up to the amount of the applicable payment (in addition to any amounts otherwise protected under part 212 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations), as exempt from a garnishment order without requiring the consent of the party serving the garnishment order or the judgment creditor.

“(iii) LIABILITY.—A financial institution that acts in good faith in reliance on clauses (i) or (ii) shall not be subject to liability or regulatory action under any Federal or State law, regulation, court or other order, or regulatory interpretation for actions concerning any applicable payments.

“(D) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) ACCOUNT HOLDER.—The term ‘account holder’ means a natural person whose name appears in a financial institution’s records as the direct or beneficial owner of an account.

“(ii) ACCOUNT REVIEW.—The term ‘account review’ means the process of examining deposits in an account to determine if an applicable payment has been deposited into the account during the lookback period. The financial institution shall perform the account review following the procedures outlined in section 212.5 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations and in accordance with the requirements of section 212.6 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(iii) APPLICABLE PAYMENT.—The term ‘applicable payment’ means—

“(I) any advance refund amount paid pursuant to subsection (f) of section 6428 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986,

“(II) any payment made by a possession of the United States with a mirror code tax system (as defined in subsection (c)) pursuant to such subsection which corresponds to a payment described in subclause (I), and

“(III) any payment made by a possession of the United States without a mirror code tax system (as so defined) pursuant to subsection (c).

“(iv) GARNISHMENT.—The term ‘garnishment’ means execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

“(v) GARNISHMENT ORDER.—The term ‘garnishment order’ means a writ, order, notice, summons, judgment, levy, or similar written instruction issued by a court, a State or State agency, a municipality or municipal corporation, or a State child support enforcement agency, including a lien arising by operation of law for overdue child support or an order to freeze the assets in an account, to effect a garnishment against a debtor.

“(vi) LOOKBACK PERIOD.—The term ‘lookback period’ means the two month period that begins on the date preceding the date of account review and ends on the corresponding date of the month two months earlier, or on the last date of the month two months earlier if the corresponding date does not exist.”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) PROHIBITIONS.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect as if included in section 2201 of the CARES Act.

(2) PROTECTION.—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. ENHANCED EMPLOYEE HIRING AND RETENTION PAYROLL TAX CREDIT.

(a) INCREASE IN CREDIT PERCENTAGE.—Section 2301(a) of the CARES Act is amended by striking “50 percent” and inserting “65 percent”.

(b) INCREASE IN PER EMPLOYEE LIMITATION.—Section 2301(b)(1) of the CARES Act is amended by striking “for all calendar quarters shall not exceed \$10,000.” and inserting “shall not exceed—

“(A) \$10,000 in any calendar quarter, and

“(B) \$30,000 in the aggregate for all calendar quarters.”.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—

(1) DECREASE OF REDUCTION IN GROSS RECEIPTS NECESSARY TO QUALIFY AS ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—Section 2301(c)(2)(B)(i) of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) is amended by striking “50 percent” and inserting “75 percent”.

(2) ELECTION TO DETERMINE GROSS RECEIPTS TEST BASED ON PRIOR QUARTER.—Section 2301(c)(2) of the CARES Act is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D) and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) ELECTION TO USE ALTERNATIVE QUARTER.—At the election of an employer who was not an eligible employer for the calendar quarter ending on June 30, 2020, subparagraph (B)(i) shall be applied—

“(i) by substituting ‘for the prior calendar quarter’ for ‘for the calendar quarter’, and

“(ii) by substituting ‘the corresponding calendar quarter in the prior year’ for ‘the same calendar quarter in the prior year’.

An election under this subparagraph shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe.”.

(d) GROSS RECEIPTS OF TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 2301(c)(2)(D) of the CARES Act (as redesignated by subsection (c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “of such Code, clauses (i) and (ii)(I)” and inserting “of such Code—

“(i) clauses (i) and (ii)(I)”,

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and”, and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(ii) any reference in this section to gross receipts shall be treated as a reference to gross receipts within the meaning of section 6033 of such Code.”.

(e) MODIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF QUALIFIED WAGES.—

(1) MODIFICATION OF THRESHOLD FOR TREATMENT AS A LARGE EMPLOYER.—Section 2301(c)(3)(A) of the CARES Act is amended by striking “100” each place it appears in clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting “500”.

(2) ELIMINATION OF LIMITATION.—Section 2301(c)(3) of the CARES Act is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B), and

(B) by striking “Such term” in the second sentence of subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The term ‘qualified wages’.”.

(3) MODIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF HEALTH PLAN EXPENSES.—Section 2301(c) of the CARES Act is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (C) of paragraph (3), and

(B) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) WAGES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘wages’ means wages (as defined in section 3121(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) and compensation (as defined in section 3231(e) of such Code).

“(B) ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN HEALTH PLAN EXPENSES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Such term shall include amounts paid or incurred by the eligible employer to provide and maintain a group

health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), but only to the extent that such amounts are excluded from the gross income of employees by reason of section 106(a) of such Code.

“(ii) ALLOCATION RULES.—For purposes of this section, amounts treated as wages under clause (i) shall be treated as paid with respect to any employee (and with respect to any period) to the extent that such amounts are properly allocable to such employee (and to such period) in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe. Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, such allocation shall be treated as properly made if made on the basis of being pro rata among periods of coverage.”.

(f) IMPROVED COORDINATION WITH PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM.—Section 1106(a)(8) of the CARES Act is amended by striking “of this Act.” and inserting “of this Act, except that such costs shall not include qualified wages (as defined in section 2301(c) of this Act) which—

“(A) are paid or incurred in calendar quarters beginning after June 30, 2020, and

“(B) are taken into account in determining the credit allowed under section 2301 of this Act.”.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYEE RETENTION TAX CREDIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 2301(g) of the CARES Act is amended to read as follows:

“(g) ELECTION TO NOT TAKE CERTAIN WAGES INTO ACCOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to qualified wages paid by an eligible employer with respect to which such employer makes an election (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe) to have this section not apply to such wages.

“(2) COORDINATION WITH PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall issue guidance providing that payroll costs paid or incurred during the covered period shall not fail to be treated as qualified wages under this section by reason of an election under paragraph (1) to the extent that a covered loan of the eligible employer is not forgiven under section 1106(b) by reason of such payroll costs. Terms used in the preceding sentence which are also used in section 1106 shall have the same meaning as when used in such section.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2301(j) of the CARES Act is amended by inserting “for any calendar quarter beginning after June 30, 2020” before the period at the end.

(g) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Section 2301(h) of the CARES Act is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Any wages taken into account in determining the credit allowed under this section shall not be taken into account as wages for purposes of sections 45A, 45B, 45P, 45S, 51, and 1396 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”, and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(h) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Section 2301(l) of the CARES Act is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) to prevent the avoidance of the purposes of the limitations under this section, including through the leaseback of employees.”.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this

section shall apply to the calendar quarters beginning after June 30, 2020.

(2) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF CERTAIN AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made subsections (d), (e)(3), and (h) shall take effect as if included in section 2301 of the CARES Act.

(B) SPECIAL RULE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 2301 of the CARES Act, an employer who has filed a return of tax with respect to applicable employment taxes (as defined in section 2301(c)(1) of such Act) before the date of the enactment of this Act may elect (in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall prescribe) to treat any applicable amount as an amount paid in the calendar quarter which includes the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—For purposes of clause (i), the term “applicable amount” means the amount of wages described in section 2301(c)(5)(B) of the CARES Act, as added by the amendments made by subsection (e)(3), which—

(I) were paid or incurred in a calendar quarter beginning after December 31, 2019, and before July 1, 2020, and

(II) were not taken into account by the taxpayer in calculating the credit allowed under section 2301(a) of such Act for such calendar quarter.

SEC. 6. EXPANSION OF WORK OPPORTUNITY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 51(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (J) and inserting “, or”, and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(K) a qualified 2020 COVID-19 unemployment recipient.”.

(b) QUALIFIED 2020 COVID-19 UNEMPLOYMENT RECIPIENT.—Section 51(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(16) QUALIFIED 2020 COVID-19 UNEMPLOYMENT RECIPIENT.—The term ‘qualified 2020 COVID-19 unemployment recipient’ means any individual who—

“(A) is certified by the designated local agency as having received, or having been approved to receive, unemployment compensation under State or Federal law for either of—

“(i) the week immediately preceding the hiring date, or

“(ii) the week which includes the hiring date, and

“(B) begins work for the employer before January 1, 2021.”.

(c) INCREASED CREDIT PERCENTAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 51(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “(50 percent in the case of a qualified 2020 COVID-19 unemployment recipient)” after “40 percent”.

(2) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—Section 51(i)(3)(A) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “shall be applied by” and inserting “shall be applied—

“(i) by”,

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “and”, and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(ii) by substituting ‘25 percent’ for ‘50 percent’.”.

(d) INCREASED LIMITATION ON WAGES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—Section 51(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “\$10,000 per year in the case of a qualified 2020 COVID-19 unemployment recipient,” after “\$6,000 per year (“.

(e) REQUIRES ELIGIBLE FOR CREDIT.—Section 51(i)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “No wages” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No wages”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) EXCEPTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—This paragraph shall not apply to any qualified 2020 COVID-19 unemployment recipient.

“(ii) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations and other guidance as may be necessary to prevent the abuse of the purposes of this subparagraph, including through the termination of employment of an individual by an employer for the purposes of claiming the credit allowed under this subsection by reason of the application of clause (i).”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals who begin work for the employer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. SAFE AND HEALTHY WORKPLACE TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an employer, there shall be allowed as a credit against applicable employment taxes for each calendar quarter an amount equal to 50 percent of the sum of—

(1) the qualified employee protection expenses,

(2) the qualified workplace reconfiguration expenses, and

(3) the qualified workplace technology expenses,

paid or incurred by the employer during such calendar quarter.

(b) LIMITATIONS AND REFUNDABILITY.—

(1) OVERALL DOLLAR LIMITATION ON CREDIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the credit allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any employer for any calendar quarter shall not exceed the excess (if any) of—

(i) the applicable dollar limit with respect to such employer for such calendar quarter, over

(ii) the aggregate credits allowed under subsection (a) with respect to such employer for all preceding calendar quarters.

(B) APPLICABLE DOLLAR LIMIT.—The term “applicable dollar limit” means, with respect to any employer for any calendar quarter, the sum of—

(i) \$1,000, multiplied by the average number of employees employed by such employer during such calendar quarter not in excess of 500, plus

(ii) \$750, multiplied by such average number of employees in excess of 500 but not in excess of 1,000, plus

(iii) \$500, multiplied by such average number of employees in excess of 1,000.

(2) CREDIT LIMITED TO EMPLOYMENT TAXES.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) with respect to any calendar quarter shall not exceed the applicable employment taxes (reduced by any credits allowed under subsections (e) and (f) of section 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, sections 7001 and 7003 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act, and section 2301 of the CARES Act) on the wages paid with respect to the employment of all the employees of the employer for such calendar quarter.

(3) REFUNDABILITY OF EXCESS CREDIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the amount of the credit under subsection (a) exceeds the limitation of paragraph (2) for any calendar quarter, such excess shall be treated as an overpayment that shall be refunded under sections 6402(a) and 6413(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(B) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—For purposes of section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, any amounts due to the employer under this paragraph shall be treated in the

same manner as a refund due from a credit provision referred to in subsection (b)(2) of such section.

(C) **QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE PROTECTION EXPENSES.**—For purposes of this section, the term “qualified employee protection expenses” means amounts paid or incurred by the employer for—

(1) testing (including on a periodic basis) employees and customers of the employer for coronavirus disease 2019, hereafter referred to in this section as “COVID-19” (including antibodies related to COVID-19),

(2) equipment to protect employees and customers of the employer from contracting COVID-19, including masks, gloves, and disinfectants, and

(3) cleaning products or services related to preventing the spread of COVID-19.

(d) **QUALIFIED WORKPLACE RECONFIGURATION EXPENSES.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “qualified workplace reconfiguration expenses” means amounts paid or incurred by the employer to design and reconfigure retail space, work areas, break areas, or other areas that employees or customers regularly use in the ordinary course of the employer’s trade or business if such design and reconfiguration—

(A) has a primary purpose of preventing the spread of COVID-19,

(B) is with respect to tangible property (within the meaning of section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) which is located in the United States and which is leased or owned by the employer,

(C) is commensurate with the risks faced by the employees or customers, or is consistent with recommendations made by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Occupational Safety and Health Administration,

(D) is completed pursuant to a reconfiguration (or similar) plan that was not in place before March 13, 2020, and

(E) is completed before January 1, 2021.

(2) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations and other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including guidance defining primary purpose and reconfiguration plan.

(e) **QUALIFIED WORKPLACE TECHNOLOGY EXPENSES.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “qualified workplace technology expenses” means amounts paid or incurred by the employer for technology systems that employees or customers use in the ordinary course of the employer’s trade or business if such technology system—

(A) has a primary purpose of preventing the spread of COVID-19,

(B) is used for limiting physical contact between customers and employees in the United States,

(C) is commensurate with the risks faced by the employees or customers, or is consistent with recommendations made by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Occupational Safety and Health Administration,

(D) is acquired by the employer on or after March 13, 2020, and is not acquired pursuant to a plan that was in place before such date, and

(E) is placed in service by the employer before January 1, 2021.

(2) **TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.**—The term “technology systems” means computer software (as defined in section 167(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) and qualified technological equipment (as defined in section 168(i)(2) of such Code).

(3) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations and other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry

out the purposes of this subsection, including guidance defining the terms “primary purpose” and “plan”.

(f) **OTHER DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) **APPLICABLE EMPLOYMENT TAXES.**—The term “applicable employment taxes” means the following:

(A) The taxes imposed under section 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(B) So much of the taxes imposed under section 3221(a) of such Code as are attributable to the rate in effect under section 3111(a) of such Code.

(2) **COVID-19.**—Except where the context clearly indicates otherwise, any reference in this section to COVID-19 shall be treated as including a reference to the virus which causes COVID-19.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury or such Secretary’s delegate.

(4) **OTHER TERMS.**—Any term used in this section which is also used in chapter 21 or 22 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall have the same meaning as when used in such chapter.

(g) **CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYERS.**—This section shall not apply to the Government of the United States, the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing.

(h) **RULES RELATING TO EMPLOYER, ETC.**—

(1) **AGGREGATION RULE.**—All persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414 of such Code, shall be treated as one employer for purposes of this section.

(2) **THIRD-PARTY PAYORS.**—Any credit allowed under subsection (a) shall be treated as a credit described in section 3511(d)(2) of such Code.

(i) **TREATMENT OF DEPOSITS.**—The Secretary shall waive any penalty under section 6656 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any failure to make a deposit of any applicable employment taxes if the Secretary determines that such failure was due to the reasonable anticipation of the credit allowed under subsection (a).

(j) **CREDIT FOR SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a self-employed individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any taxable year an amount equal to 50 percent of the sum of—

(A) the qualified employee protection expenses (as determined by treating the self-employed individual both as the employer and an employee),

(B) the qualified workplace reconfiguration expenses (as so determined), and

(C) the qualified workplace technology expenses (as so determined), paid or incurred by the individual during such taxable year.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The amount of the credit allowed under paragraph (1) with respect to any self-employed individual for any taxable year shall not exceed \$500.

(3) **REFUNDABILITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The credit determined under paragraph (1) shall be treated as a credit allowed to the taxpayer under subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code.

(B) **TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.**—For purposes of section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, any refund due from the credit determined under paragraph (1) shall be treated in the same manner as a refund due from a credit provision referred to in subsection (b)(2) of such section.

(4) **SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, the term “self-employed individual” means an individual who regularly carries on any trade or business within the meaning of section 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, other than any such trade or business which is carried on by a partnership.

(B) **DOCUMENTATION.**—No credit shall be allowed under paragraph (1) to any individual unless the individual maintains such documentation as the Secretary may prescribe to establish such individual as an eligible self-employed individual.

(k) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

(1) **DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.**—For purposes of this section—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any deduction or other credit otherwise allowable under any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to any expense for which a credit is allowed under this section shall be reduced by the amount of the credit under this section with respect to such expense.

(B) **BASIS ADJUSTMENT.**—If a credit is allowed under this section with respect to any property of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation under section 167 of such Code, the basis of such property shall be reduced by the amount of the credit so allowed, and such reduction shall be taken into account before determining the amount of any allowance for depreciation with respect to such property for purposes of such Code.

(C) **EXPENSES NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT MORE THAN ONCE.**—The same expense shall not be treated as described in more than one paragraph of subsection (a) or more than one subparagraph of subsection (j)(1), whichever is applicable.

(D) **EMPLOYER OR SELF-EMPLOYMENT CREDIT ALLOWED.**—The credit under subsection (a) and the credit for self-employed individuals under subsection (j) shall not apply to the same taxpayer.

(2) **ELECTION NOT TO HAVE SECTION APPLY.**—This section shall not apply with respect to any employer for any calendar quarter, or with respect to any self-employed individual for any taxable year, if such employer or self-employed individual elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe) not to have this section apply.

(1) **TRANSFERS TO CERTAIN TRUST FUNDS.**—There are hereby appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) and the Social Security Equivalent Benefit Account established under section 15A(a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231n-1(a)) amounts equal to the reduction in revenues to the Treasury by reason of this section (without regard to this subsection). Amounts appropriated by the preceding sentence shall be transferred from the general fund at such times and in such manner as to replicate to the extent possible the transfers which would have occurred to such Trust Fund or Account had this section not been enacted.

(m) **REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations and other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section, including—

(1) with respect to the application of the credit under subsection (a) to third-party payors (including professional employer organizations, certified professional employer organizations, or agents under section 3504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), regulations or other guidance allowing such payors to submit documentation necessary to substantiate the amount of the credit allowed under subsection (a),

(2) regulations or other guidance for recapturing the benefit of credits determined under subsection (a) in cases where there is a subsequent adjustment to the credit determined under such subsection, and

(3) regulations or other guidance to prevent abuse of the purposes of this section.

(n) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall only apply to amounts paid or incurred after March 12, 2020, and before January 1, 2021.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN AMOUNTS PAID OR INCURRED IN CALENDAR QUARTERS ENDING BEFORE THE DATE OF THE ENACTMENT OF THIS ACT.—For purposes of this section, in the case of any amount paid or incurred after March 12, 2020, and on or before the last day of the last calendar quarter ending before the date of the enactment of this Act, such amount shall be treated as paid or incurred on such date of enactment.

SEC. 8. COVID-19 ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS.

(a) INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR STATUS.—With respect to an individual providing services for compensation for any service recipient or through any marketplace platform, if the service recipient or marketplace platform operator provides any of the benefits described in subsection (c) to such individual, the provision of such benefits shall not be taken into account in determining the status of such individual as an employee for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) TREATMENT AS QUALIFIED DISASTER RELIEF PAYMENTS.—Any benefit described in subsection (c) (other than paragraph (1) thereof) which is provided as described in subsection (a) by a service recipient or marketplace platform operator shall be treated for purposes of section 139 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as a qualified disaster relief payment to the individual so described.

(c) BENEFITS DESCRIBED.—The benefits described in this subsection are—

(1) financial assistance provided to an individual while the individual is not performing services for the service recipient or through the marketplace platform, or is performing reduced services or reduced hours of service, because of COVID-19;

(2) health care benefits provided to an individual which are related to COVID-19, including testing of the individual for, or for antibodies related to, COVID-19;

(3) equipment to protect the individual, service recipients, or customers from contracting COVID-19, including masks, gloves, and disinfectants;

(4) cleaning products or services related to preventing the spread of COVID-19; and

(5) training, standards, and guidelines or other similar information provided to an individual related to COVID-19.

(d) MARKETPLACE PLATFORM, ETC.—For purposes of this section—

(1) MARKETPLACE PLATFORM OPERATOR.—The term “marketplace platform operator” means any person operating a marketplace platform.

(2) MARKETPLACE PLATFORM.—The term “marketplace platform” means any digital website, mobile application, or similar system that facilitates the provision of goods or services by providers to recipients.

(e) COVID-19.—For purposes of this section, the term “COVID-19” means coronavirus disease 2019. Except where the context clearly indicates otherwise, any reference in this section to such disease shall be treated as including a reference to the virus which causes such disease.

(f) APPLICATION.—This section shall only apply to benefits provided after March 12, 2020, and before January 1, 2021.

SEC. 9. APPLICATION OF SPECIAL RULES TO MONEY PURCHASE PENSION PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2202(a)(6)(B) of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) is amended by inserting “, and, in the case of a money purchase pension plan, a coronavirus-related distribution which is an in-service withdrawal shall be treated as meeting the distribution rules of section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986” before the period.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply as if included in the enactment of section 2202 of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136).

SEC. 10. CLARIFICATION OF DELAY IN PAYMENT OF MINIMUM REQUIRED CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 3608(a)(1) of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) is amended by striking “January 1, 2021” and inserting “January 4, 2021”.

SEC. 11. EMPLOYEE CERTIFICATION AS TO ELIGIBILITY FOR INCREASED CARES ACT LOAN LIMITS FROM EMPLOYER PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2202(b) of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) EMPLOYEE CERTIFICATION.—The administrator of a qualified employer plan may rely on an employee’s certification that the requirements of subsection (a)(4)(A)(ii) are satisfied in determining whether the employee is a qualified individual for purposes of this subsection.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 2202(b) of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136).

SEC. 12. ELECTION TO WAIVE APPLICATION OF CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS TO FARMING LOSSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2303 of the CARES Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) SPECIAL RULES WITH RESPECT TO FARMING LOSSES.—

“(1) ELECTION TO DISREGARD APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS MADE BY SUBSECTIONS (a) AND (b).—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a taxpayer who has a farming loss (within the meaning of section 172(b)(1)(B)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for a taxable year beginning in 2018, 2019, or 2020 makes an election under this paragraph, then—

“(i) the amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to any taxable year beginning in 2018, 2019, or 2020, and

“(ii) the amendments made by subsection (b) shall not apply to any net operating loss arising in any taxable year beginning in 2018, 2019, or 2020.

“(B) ELECTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii)(II), an election under this paragraph shall be made in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Such election, once made for any taxable year, shall be irrevocable for such taxable year.

“(ii) TIME FOR MAKING ELECTION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—An election under this paragraph shall be made by the due date (including extensions of time) for filing the taxpayer’s return for the taxable year.

“(II) PREVIOUSLY FILED RETURNS.—In the case of any taxable year for which the taxpayer has filed a return of Federal income tax before the date of the enactment of the Coronavirus Relief Fair Unemployment Compensation Act of 2020 which disregards the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b), such taxpayer shall be treated as having made an election under this paragraph unless the taxpayer modifies such return to reflect such amendments by the due date (including extensions of time) for filing the tax-

payer’s return for the first taxable year ending after the date of the enactment of the Coronavirus Relief Fair Unemployment Compensation Act of 2020.

“(C) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall issue such regulations and other guidance as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, including regulations and guidance relating to the application of the rules of section 172(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect before the date of the enactment of the CARES Act) to taxpayers making an election under this paragraph.

“(2) REVOCATION OF ELECTION TO WAIVE CARRYBACK.—The last sentence of section 172(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the last sentence of section 172(b)(1)(B) of such Code shall not apply to any election—

“(A) which was made before the date of the enactment of the Coronavirus Relief Fair Unemployment Compensation Act of 2020, and

“(B) which relates to the carryback period provided under section 172(b)(1)(B) of such Code with respect to any net operating loss arising in taxable years beginning in 2018 or 2019.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 2303 of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136).

SEC. 13. OVERSIGHT AND AUDIT REPORTING.

Section 19010(a)(1) of the CARES Act is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (F), by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (G), and by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(H) the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

“(I) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator RON WYDEN, intend to object to proceeding to S. 3398, a bill to eliminate abusive and rampant neglect of interactive technologies, and for other purposes, dated August 3, 2020.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have one request for a committee to meet during today’s session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, August 3, 2020, at 5:30 p.m. to consider favorably reporting pending nominations.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges until August 8, 2020: Rachel Carpenter, Brett Abbott, Rachel Altman, Daniel Rankin, Maddie Martin, Jacob Lambert, Noah Vehafic, Jackson Berryman, and Duke Garschina.

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

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDED 1ST QUARTER REPORT FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2020

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Morgan Carter: Morocco	Dirham		819.41						819.41
Patrick Carroll: Morocco	Dirham		819.41						819.41
Elizabeth King: Morocco	Dirham		819.41						819.41
Dianne Neller: Morocco	Dirham		819.41						819.41
Adrienne McCann: Morocco	Dirham		819.41						819.41
Total			4,097.05						4,097.05

*Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

RICHARD C. SHELBY,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, July 24, 2020.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S.
4323

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 4323 and the bill be referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, AUGUST 4,
2020

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, August 4; 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, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of Executive Calendar No. 711. I further ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the postcloture time expire at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come be-

fore the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:12 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, August 4, 2020, at 10 a.m.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on August 3, 2020 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

MICHAEL P. O'RIELLY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2019 (REAPPOINTMENT), WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MARCH 18, 2020.

ANTHONY J. TATA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY, VICE JOHN C. ROOD, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JUNE 11, 2020.