

Maryland, though, is a big State, and we needed more help. So I thank the Small Business Administration in its announcement of two additional small business centers in the State of Maryland. One will be in Baltimore. It will be housed at Morgan State University, a historic HBCU. That will provide, I think, tremendous help for women-owned businesses and minority women-owned businesses. We are also opening up a center in Salisbury, on the Eastern Shore of Maryland—rural Maryland—to help women's businesses. This is critically important in dealing with the gap in our communities. Resource partners are of critical need.

So, as we applaud the work we have done with the PPP program and as we recognize we need to improve it, let's also recognize we need to deal with making sure there is a fair opportunity for all businesses to qualify. We are also going to need additional help for small businesses in addition to the PPP initial grant. There needs to be a second round, and let me tell you why.

We thought 8 weeks would be enough with the PPP program, but we know that for some of the original small business loans that were taken out under the PPP program that, within the next 2 weeks, the 8-week period will expire, but we know that businesses are not yet open at full capacity. Restaurants cannot open at full capacity. Catering establishments cannot open at full capacity. Health clubs cannot open at full capacity. Entertainment centers cannot open at full capacity. We know that museums are still very much hurt, so we are going to need additional help.

Yesterday, we heard from a small business owner whose company was helped by the PPP loan. He told us there will be additional need for bridge funding for small businesses experiencing unanticipated costs during the phased-in reopening. I agree with him. I think we are going to have to do more to help the small businesses in our communities.

I have been working with Senator SHAHEEN and Senator COONS and others to say, on the second round, let's try to target the relief to those companies that really need it. The first round—get the money out quickly. We were very successful in doing that. There was a minimal amount of underwriting requirements by the small businesses or the banks. We got the money out quickly.

On the second round, we need to be more discerning. We need to focus those funds on those small businesses that really need it, those in the underserved communities—the smaller of the small businesses. We heard that yesterday during our oversight hearings. Those businesses have had a dramatic loss of revenue. If we do that, the resources are there; we can help those small businesses survive, and we can do it in a way that will keep our economy going.

We need to do that immediately. We shouldn't wait 2 more weeks after the

program for many small businesses has already ended. We need to provide the help as soon as possible. That is another reason it is important that we take up the next stimulus package during this work period and not wait until businesses have to lay off their workers and may not be able to reopen.

The PPP was only one of three tools. The second tool we provided was a new initiative under the EIDL Program, the Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program, for grants. It provides for immediate cash, which is what businesses need during a disaster—cash. The proposal allowed for a \$10,000 grant to be made. We anticipated that grant would be made within 3 days. We put that in the statute.

As complimentary as I have been about the SBA starting up the PPP program, I am extremely disappointed in the manner in which the EIDL Program has been handled. They did not get the money out quickly. They did not get \$10,000 out; instead, the average grant was between \$4,000 and \$5,000. And there is \$10 billion still left in the coffers that could have gotten out to small businesses that desperately needed the cash, and they didn't do it in the timeframe Congress anticipated.

The existing loan program, which existed before COVID-19, where SBA issues loans during a disaster, called the Economic Injury Disaster Loans, provides working capital. It works with PPP. PPP is not enough help for a small business to get the working capital and inventory they need. That is why we have the EIDL loans. The SBA has been very slow in getting the loans out. The numbers are extremely disappointing.

Now they have set up new rules. They closed the window for nonagricultural small businesses. Why? I have no idea. They seem to be limiting loans to \$150,000, although the loan provides for a \$2 million cap. Why are they doing that?

If the programs are going to work together, they have to implement this program. Congress specifically intended COVID-19 to be a disaster covered by EIDL. We did that in our earlier stimulus package. Well, we are disappointed that we haven't had greater success in the EIDL Program, because we know it works so much closer with the PPP program, and it is particularly useful for smaller small businesses and those that are more vulnerable.

We had a witness yesterday, Nick Rudolph of Maryland Capital Enterprises, who testified and said:

The EIDL loan is a particularly impactful product . . . because of its low interest, long terms, eased credit requirements and the fact that collateral is not required. In a perfect world, all approved applicants would receive the full grant portion regardless of number of employees.

What Mr. Rudolph is saying is they limited the grant to \$1,000 per worker, and, therefore, if you had 10 or fewer workers, the most vulnerable of small businesses, you were not able to take

advantage of the \$10,000. We hope that will be corrected.

There is a third tool. That is loan forgiveness for existing 7(a) and 504 loans and microloans and for loans taken out during the 6-month period after the adoption of the bill through the end of the year. This gives 6 months of debt relief for loans that can really help small businesses. I would like to report on how that is working, but I don't have a lot of numbers on that, which leads me to the need for data. If we are going to carry out our oversight function, if we are going to be able to enact legislation going forward, we need to know how the programs are working today, and we haven't gotten the information we need.

Earlier I authored a letter to Senators SCHUMER and WYDEN, asking the SBA to make that information available. Most recently, I joined Senator RUBIO in a similar request asking the Small Business Administration to make this information available. I introduced legislation with Senator SHAHEEN on this issue. We need to get that data if we are going to do our oversight.

This week we had the private sector witnesses; next week we have Administrator Carranza, Administrator of the SBA, and Secretary Mnuchin, Secretary of the Treasury, to ask specifically about these points. It will be a very, very important hearing.

In closing, let me say that we have to continue to work together as we have in the past to help America's small businesses. They are literally the growth engine of our economy. They are the innovators of our economy, and they are the most vulnerable.

The CARES Act provided incredibly important help, but we are going to have to pay additional attention to help our small businesses. So let's continue this bipartisan effort not only to help small businesses but to help our economy and to help our country. In doing that we will truly perform as we should during this national emergency.

So I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pay attention to what we have already done for small businesses and give them the additional attention that they need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before Senator CARDIN leaves the floor, I want to tell my colleague and friend on the Finance Committee that it has been a pleasure to team up with him to try to deal with these challenges in terms of getting the help out to small business people. We know that it has been needlessly challenging, looking back at the experience. I am just glad my colleague is going to prosecute the case until there is justice for these small businesses.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL PACK

Madam President, the Senate nears a vote on the nomination of Michael

Pack to head up the U.S. Agency for Global Media. This typically is a job that doesn't get a whole lot of attention here on the Senate floor, but this time, I believe it should.

This is yet another Trump nominee who appears to be covering up a whole array of sketchy financial wheeling and self-dealing, and apparently my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are just looking the other way, not interested.

So here is the short version of the story. For more than a decade, Mr. Pack ran two entities—a nonprofit film organization and a for-profit production company. His nonprofit raised millions of dollars under its tax-exempt status, and it pumped that money into his for-profit production company, nowhere else. At a minimum, this looks to me like a serious, flagrant abuse of a taxpayer subsidy. Mr. Pack made false statements about this arrangement to the IRS. So as the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, I care greatly about that matter if one were to look at nothing else.

When he was first nominated in the previous Congress, Mr. Pack got caught in these false statements by staff on the Foreign Relations Committee. When he was renominated in this Congress and submitted new paperwork, he made false statements about having made false statements. Truly astounding.

Now there are a host of unanswered questions about Mr. Pack's murky financial dealings. Fortunately, Ranking Member MENENDEZ is still trying to get to the bottom of this. Now, Ranking Member MENENDEZ is doing his job by the book. He is doing his job. He has been in communication with the administration when it comes to the vetting process for the nominees and, every step along the way, has tried to do responsible vetting.

Furthermore, the financial web of Mr. Pack is under investigation by the Attorney General of the District of Columbia. Why not wait to get the results of that investigation? Why rush to confirm a nominee before all the facts are before the Senate? This is a question over whether a nominee broke the law and ripped off taxpayers.

When Democrats on the Senate committee of jurisdiction tried to investigate it, Mr. Pack told everybody to just go pound sand. So once again, we have a Trump nominee making a mockery of the Senate constitutional responsibility, and as far as I can tell, the Senate is just going to do nothing about it.

(Mr. YOUNG assumed the Chair.)

For my last few minutes, I just want to remind colleagues of the way things used to be. The way it used to be is both sides of the Senate took advice and consent seriously. For example, in 2009, Chairman Baucus and Ranking Member GRASSLEY held up one nominee and wrote an exhaustive 12-page memo over a matter of \$53 in local tax late fees and some sloppy paperwork. An-

other 2009 nomination, Ron Kirk, to be the U.S. Trade Representative, was held up for months over a tax matter involving some basketball tickets and a television he donated to his local YMCA. In 2010, another nominee was grilled in his hearing before the Finance Committee over a tax debt of \$800.

Senators on both sides of the aisle—both sides of the aisle—always tried to do a thorough vetting and tried to work on it together. In all three of these cases, which I remember as a member of the Finance Committee, the nominees answered the Senate's questions, paid what they owed, and that was that. The Senate did its job, and it was the right thing to do.

I think as we move to the vote here in the Senate, we ought to start talking about one question, and that is this: What has changed in the Senate about the vetting process of these nominees? What happened to the old bipartisan commitment to advise and consent, to fully vet nominees? The majority has just rubberstamped and rubberstamped some more. Trump nominees show a blatant disregard and disdain for the oversight process that historically has been central to the bipartisan work of this body.

Now the President might be totally indifferent to the role and duties of the Senate, but I don't see any reason why Senators here, Democrats or Republicans, have to agree with that. It undermines the role of this Senate and the Congress as a coequal branch of government. The precedent of a bipartisan vetting process simply cannot withstand it.

It has been said here before that the Federal Government doesn't need anybody so badly that the person should get a special set of rules. That, regrettably, is the way it seems to be for this nominee—a nominee whose finances are currently under investigation and, apparently, with the majority's support, is going to get confirmed because the majority has decided to essentially set aside years and years of bipartisan work, responsible work, to thoroughly investigate and vet those who are nominated to serve in our government.

I am going to oppose this nomination, and I hope my colleagues will think about what is really at issue here, because what goes around comes around. Is the Senate going to get serious about the way matters used to be handled, particularly on the Senate Finance Committee, since we have a member of our committee in the Presiding Officer's chair? The Senate Finance Committee did it right, did it right for years, by the books, in a bipartisan fashion. That is not being used here; in fact, it is being tossed out the window. I think the Senate is going to regret it. I urge my colleagues to oppose the nominee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I would like 3 minutes to close the debate on Michael Pack.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL PACK

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President and fellow Senators, we are about to do the final vote on Michael Pack. This man is uniquely qualified to hold this position. He has done an outstanding job. Everyone should look at the most recent documentary he did on the Supreme Court. It was just outstanding.

There has been a political fight over him for 2 years and 1 day. Today is the moment of truth. It is time to vote on Mr. Pack. Debate is closed.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON PACK NOMINATION

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

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

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 113 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Daines	Lee
Barrasso	Enzi	Loeffler
Blackburn	Ernst	Manchin
Blunt	Fischer	McConnell
Boozman	Gardner	McSally
Braun	Graham	Moran
Capito	Grassley	Murkowski
Cassidy	Hawley	Paul
Collins	Hoeven	Perdue
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Portman
Cotton	Inhofe	Risch
Cramer	Johnson	Roberts
Crapo	Kennedy	Romney
Cruz	Lankford	Rounds