

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

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

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

HEALS ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator for South Dakota.

NEW MARKETS FOR STATE-INSPECTED MEAT AND POULTRY ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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