DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1520

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 128, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 128) directing the clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1520.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 128) was agreed to.

UNITED STATES—MEXICO ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP ACT—Continued

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my colleague, Finance Committee Ranking Member WYDEN, to discuss a tax provision included in the omnibus appropriations bill currently before the Senate. The tax title in this bill contains important clarifications to, and expansions of, the Employee Retention Tax Credit established under section 2301 of the CARES Act. This credit has provided vital payroll support to struggling businesses in Iowa and across the country. The enhancements included in this bill are necessary to help more employers access the credit. Importantly, the bill clarifies that businesses that received Paycheck Protection Program loans, or PPP, are still eligible for the credit based on other wages and benefits paid. Does Member WYDEN agree that our intent is to allow struggling small businesses to access the retention credit, even if they have received a PPP loan?

Mr. WYDEN. That is correct. COVID–19 has shuttered small businesses across the Country. This is especially true in Oregon, where small businesses are the backbone of our economy. Ensuring businesses can access relief from both the Paycheck Protection Program and the Employee Retention Tax Credit is critical. The legislation before us today would allow businesses who took out a PPP loan to access the retention credit in two instances. First, those businesses that have had or will have their loan forgiven can claim the credit for any wages that were not paid for with PPP loan proceeds. Second, a business that does not have its PPP loan forgiven can claim the credit for any wages. As this change will be retroactive, does the Chairman agree that it is equally as critical that these small businesses are able to quickly and easily claim these past credits they will now be eligible for?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Yes. That is why we are allowing these businesses, both those with forgiven loans and those without, to claim credits for wages paid in previous quarters that this bill makes eligible for the credit on their fourth quarter 2020 payroll tax filings. This will prevent small businesses from having to amend their previously filed payroll tax returns, easing the paperwork burden for both taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service. I know Ranking Member WYDEN will join me in urging the IRS to do all they can to simplify and expedite the process for eligible businesses retroactively claiming the retention credit. The last thing these businesses need right now is additional, complex payroll tax filings.

I thank the ranking member for engaging in this colloquy to discuss this important issue and the clarification included in the pending appropriations bill.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I wish to enter remarks regarding the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, which I will refer to as the 2021 Approps Act.

Specifically, my remarks are about sections 1001 through 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act. I was the sponsor and principal drafter of these sections. I also negotiated the final legislative text of these sections with Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin and my Democratic colleagues in the Senate, including Democratic Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER.

These sections relate to the Federal Reserve's temporary emergency lending facilities under section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act that are creatures of the CARES Act P.L. 116–136. These facilities were established in response to the extreme turmoil in the credit markets caused by the COVID–19 pandemic in March 2020. They were made possible by $500 billion in funding and authority provided by the CARES Act. As a result, these facilities are often referred to as the CARES Act facilities, which is how I will refer to them.

The CARES Act facilities are the Primary Market Corporate Credit Facility, the Secondary Market Corporate Credit Facility, the Municipal Liquidity Facility, the Main Street Lending Program, and the Term Asset-Backed Securities Loan Facility (TALF). The CARES Act required and Congress intended the CARES Act facilities to cease operations by December 31, 2020.

I was one of the two Republican Senators involved in drafting the CARES ACT provisions that provided the funding and authority for the CAREES Act facilities. During the last 2 days—December 19, 2020 and December 20, 2020—I have spoken at length on the Senate floor about the creation, intended purpose, and success of these facilities, as well as the impact of sections 1001 through 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act on these facilities and the reasons for enacting these sections. As a result, I will not repeat those remarks now.

Today, I would like to focus on the impact of one particular section of the 2021 Approps Act: section 1005. But let me first remind my colleagues of what sections 1001 through 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act do. Collectively, these sections rescind more than $429 billion of unused money out of the CARES Act facilities and use that money for other important purposes; definitively end the CARES Act facilities by December 31, 2020, as Congress intended and the CARES Act requires; forbid the CARES Act facilities from being restarted; and prevent the CARES Act facilities from being replicated without congressional approval.

Specifically, section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act prevents the creation of any Federal Reserve emergency lending facility established under section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act that is ''the same as'' any CARES Act facility. Because an earlier version of TALF was established in 2008 prior to the CARES Act, section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act specifically allows TALF—but only TALF—to be replicated in the future without congressional approval. Under section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act, all of the other CARES Act facilities—the Primary Market Corporate Credit Facility, the Secondary Market Corporate Credit Facility, the Municipal Liquidity Facility, and the Main Street Lending Program—cannot be replicated in the future without congressional approval.

So what does it mean for a new facility to be ''the same as'' a CARES Act facility? That question can easily be answered by looking at the purpose of the CARES Act facilities. The purpose of each CARES Act facility is identified in its term sheet.

Let's walk through them. The purpose of the Primary Market Corporate Credit Facility was to lend directly to corporations by purchasing bonds or syndicated loans from them at issuance. The purpose of the Secondary Market Corporate Credit Facility was to purchase corporate bonds and corporate bond Exchange Traded Funds (ETFs) in the secondary market. The purpose of the Municipal Liquidity Facility was to lend directly to states and municipalities by purchasing their municipal bonds from them at issuance. The purpose of the Main Street Lending Program was to extend credit directly to small or medium sized businesses, including nonprofit organizations.

These purposes are clear and are what define each of the CARES Act facilities. A future lending facility that had the same purpose as a CARES Act facility would be the ''same as'' as CARES Act facility and therefore could

not be created without congressional approval. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve would need to come to Congress for approval, just as they did at the time of the creation of the CARES Act facilities.

Unfortunately, I have seen some uninformed reporters and outside commentators incorrectly assert that section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act only prevents the creation of new lending facilities if the facilities are ''identical to'' or ''exactly the same as'' the CARES Act facilities. That is manifestly not true. Section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act does not say that, nor was that the intent of Congress. I should know because unlike these reporters and commentators I drafted and negotiated the final text of section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act with my Democratic colleagues, including Minority Leader SCHUMER.

During the course of our negotiations, Democrats actually proposed that we use the phrase ''identical to'' in section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act. I specifically rejected this proposal because ''identical to'' is far too limited in scope. If section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act had used the word ''identical to'' than that would mean only a new facility that is identical to a CARES Act facility in every way would be prohibited. That would defeat the entire purpose of section 1005.

It would have allowed the Treasury and the Federal Reserve to essentially restart the CARES Act facilities, which section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act separately prohibits them from restarting, by simply tinkering with their terms and launching them under a new name. For example, the terms of the Municipal Liquidity Facility only allow it to purchase bonds directly from and state and municipal issuers that have a maturity of up to 3 years. If a new facility was the same in every way as the Municipal Liquidity Facility with the exception that it could purchase bonds with maturities up to 10 years, rather than up to 3 years, than it would not be ''identical to'' the Municipal Liquidity Facility and therefore could be created. However, such a facility would be the same as the current Municipal Liquidity Facility because it is lending directly to States and municipalities.

My Republican colleagues and I did not want to permit for such a loophole in the law. That is why I specifically rejected my Democratic colleagues' proposal that we use the phrase ''identical to'' any CARES Act facility. In our negotiations, I told him that we did not want the Treasury and Federal Reserve to replicate the CARES Act facilities by tinkering with their terms and then launching them under different names. Ultimately, my Democratic colleagues conceded on this point and agreed to compromise by using the broader phrase ''the same as'' instead.

So where does that leave us? Section 1005 of the 2021 Approps Act prevents a new Federal Reserve emergency lending facility from being established under section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act without congressional approval, if the facility has the same purpose as a CARES Act facility. The CARES Act facilities were unprecedented facilities that the Treasury, with the support of the Federal Reserve, requested that Congress make possible. Congress did so through the CARES Act. These facilities required legislation in March 2020 and the same types of facilities would require legislation in the future if the Treasury and the Federal Reserve believed they needed to engage in such bond purchasing and direct lending again.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Virginia, the vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, for his work on the Intelligence Authorization Act, which is now part of the omnibus appropriations bill. I wish to address a few provisions that have been removed or modified.

First, the IAA, as reported by the Senate Intelligence Committee in June, included a provision requiring the DNI to submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees on the implementation of Presidential Policy Directive 28. That report covers the classified annex referenced in section 3 of PPD–28.

This report is extremely important. It will allow the committees to conduct oversight of signals intelligence collection conducted pursuant to Executive Order 12333. It will also provide the committee the ability to understand how the government interprets and implements PPD–28, which has broad legal, policy, and diplomatic implications. In response to the outrage from our European allies regarding U.S. signals intelligence operations revealed by Edward Snowden, President Obama issued PPD–28 in January 2014. PPD–28 covers topics that are directly relevant to both Americans and foreigners, such as bulk collection. The directive, and its classified annex in particular, is designed to evaluate the benefits and risks of signals intelligence operations. It was intended to reassure our allies about the scope of U.S. signals intelligence collection and to serve as a cornerstone for data-sharing agreements, which are still ongoing. Unlike FISA collection, however, there is no judicial oversight of collection conducted pursuant to EO 12333 and governed by PPD–28. For all these reasons, therefore, it is absolutely critical that there be serious congressional oversight of PPD–28.

The PPD–28 reporting requirement was not merely part of the IAA reported by the committee. It was in the version of the IAA that was attached to the National Defense Authorization Act that passed the full Senate in July. That version was never passed into law, however, because the IAA fell off the NDAA, which is why the IAA is now part of the omnibus appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, during the negotiations leading up to this bill, the House Intelligence Committee minority insisted that this bipartisan, Senate-passed provision be modified so that the portion of the report on the classified annex of PPD–28 is submitted to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the congressional intelligence committee. To the extent this language could be misinterpreted to limit access by the full committees, it is unacceptable and unprecedented. Congress should not be in the position of passing legislation that could be seen as limiting its ability to fulfill its own oversight responsibilities.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I agree that the report required by the IAA on PPD–28 is critically important and central to the committee's oversight responsibilities. I share the Senator's dismay that this provision was modified in this way and through what I consider to be an unfortunate conference process that should not be repeated. More generally, I oppose legislation that would purport to restrict full committee access and impede the critical oversight provided by the full committee.

This provision, as modified, states that the DNI will submit the report to the chairman and vice chairman. It does not, however, preclude its provision to the other members of the committee. As vice chairman of the committee, it is my intent to push for the full committee to get this report. It is also my intent to seek to amend this language so that it is not misinterpreted to limit full committee access.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Senator from Virginia. On another topic, the vice chairman and I worked together to include in the IAA a number of critically important provisions protecting whistleblowers. Again, at the insistence of the House Intelligence Committee minority, those provisions were taken out. The latest was the removal of a provision that would help whistleblowers whose security clearances have been revoked as a form of reprisal. Those provisions need to be passed into law.

Mr. WARNER. I agree. I strongly supported each of the five whistleblower protection provisions in the IAA. It is my intent to keep fighting for them so that they are on next year's IAA and are passed into law.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friends from Oregon and Virginia for their hard work on the Senate Intelligence Committee. I agree with them that oversight by the full Senate Intelligence Committee on these and other intelligence matters is at the core of the Senate's constitutional responsibilities. I, too, agree that the language should not be interpreted to limit that full committee oversight. I also strongly agree with the Senators' views on the critical importance of protecting whistleblowers. The abuses of the outgoing administration have illustrated the urgent need for these legislative protections.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, Senator CARPER, ranking member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senator JOHN KENNEDY, and I, as chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, are the principal Senate authors of section 103 in Division S of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021—the American Innovation and Manufacturing, ''AIM'', Act of 2020, hereinafter ''section 103''. This bipartisan legislation will phase down the production and consumption of hydrofluorocarbons, HFCs, which are potent greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change. As authors, we submit these comments to provide the Senate with additional information regarding the development of section 103.

Section 103 establishes a new, national program administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, to phase down the production and consumption of certain HFC substances. Section 103 vests EPA with authority to phase down the production and consumption of these substances in a comprehensive manner. It is designed to provide regulatory certainty. Specifically, section 103 requires EPA to implement an 85 percent phase down of the production and consumption of regulated HFC substances, so those levels reach approximately 15 percent of their 2011–2013 average annual levels by 2036. Importantly, this section includes provisions to safeguard consumers and American manufacturers from cost increases during the phase down while still adhering to the phase down timetable in subsection (e)(2)(C).

The text of section 103 reflects bipartisan, necessary improvements to the original, introduced text in the Senate. On March 4, 2020, Senator KENNEDY filed amendment No. 1504 to S. 2657, which was identical to stand-alone legislation, S. 2754, the American Innovation and Manufacturing Act of 2019. Ranking Member CARPER of the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works Committee, EPW, cosponsored amendment No. 1504 and S. 2754. EPW Chairman BARRASSO opposed amendment No. 1504 and S. 2754 as introduced, hereinafter ''introduced legislation''.

On March 25, 2020, Chairman BARRASSO and Ranking Member CARPER began an electronic information-gathering process on S. 2754 by EPW to solicit the views of stakeholders. This process allowed EPW to hear safely from many stakeholders during the COVID–19 pandemic. The extensive information-gathering process generated filings from a range of industries, States, interest groups, and individuals.

We relied on the valuable information gained through that process to improve the introduced legislation and to reach collective agreement on amended text. This agreement was filed as amendment No. 2655 to S. 2657 on September 10, 2020. Section 103 closely resembles the text of amendment No. 2655.

Our agreed-upon changes to the introduced legislation have focused in a few key areas identified by Chairman BARRASSO. The first key area is ''essential uses'' of regulated HFC substances. The introduced legislation offered immediate relief for some special circumstances, including feedstocks and process agents. For example, in a provision that has been present in all versions of the legislation, subsection (e)(4)(A) assures there are no regulatory requirements for ''a regulated substance that is used and entirely consumed (except for trace quantities) in the manufacture of another chemical.'' Where trace quantities of an HFC regulated substance, including impurities or unreacted feedstock chemical, remain through transformation of a regulated HFC substance into another product, that activity is covered by the exemption as soon as the Act is enacted into law.

The introduced legislation did not provide immediate protection for essential uses. Subsection (e)(4)(B) now provides that relief for essential uses. Congress has identified six essential uses in subsection (e)(4)(B)(iv) that are designated by law as essential uses upon enactment: No. 1, propellant in metered dose inhalers; No. 2, defense sprays; No. 3, structural composite preformed polyurethane foam for marine use and trailer use; No. 4, the etching of semiconductor material or wafers and the cleaning of chemical vapor deposition chambers within the semiconductor manufacturing sector; No. 5, mission-critical military end uses, such as armored vehicle engine and shipboard fire suppression systems and systems used in deployable and expeditionary applications; and No. 6, onboard aerospace fire suppression.

In implementing this legislation, EPA must allocate, by rule, the full quantity of allowances needed by each of these six congressionally designated uses for at least 5 years. This rulemaking only determines the quantities of mandatory allowances that are allocated to each of the six uses above.

Under subsection (e)(4)(B)(i)–(iii), EPA may, by rule, designate other uses as essential uses and allocate any such use a quantity of allowances, provided certain criteria are met and subject to the applicable phasedown timelines and regulations for the production and consumption of HFCs under (e)(2)–(3). The Administrator is required to review each essential use application every 5 years and shall continue to make available essential use allowances if the Administrator determines, subject to notice and opportunity for public comment, that statutory criteria are met under subsection (e)(4)(B)(v).

The second key area of change from the introduced legislation is express preemption of certain State and local laws, reflected in subsection (k)(2). With respect to an exclusive use for which a mandatory allocation of allowances is provided under subsection (e)(4)(B)(iv)(I), subsection (k)(2)(A) preempts any enforcement of a statute or administrative action by a State or political subdivision of a State for 5 years from the date of enactment. Preemption is potentially extendable for up to—but not more than—10 years, as provided in subsection (k)(2)(B).

The third key area of change from the introduced legislation is the protection of consumers and businesses from cost increases. Of particular note, under subsection (f)(2)(B), EPA cannot accelerate the 15-year regulatory timeline faster than HFC consumption levels that the market is already achieving. However, EPA must ensure any level set under this subsection is at least as stringent as the production and consumption levels of regulated substances required under subsection (e)(2)(C) for a given year, as provided in subsection (f)(6). Language to protect consumers and businesses, particularly residential and small business consumers, has also been added to regulatory provisions throughout the bill, including essential uses (subsection (e)(4)–(5)), accelerated schedule (subsection (f)), and technology transitions (subsection (i)).

Together we support section 103. We thank our House colleagues for working together with us to improve further our Senate agreement reached in September 2020. Through negotiations with leaders of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce, we agreed to additional changes to improve legislative clarity, including language to help protect affordability for residential and small business consumers while also protecting the environment.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, section 201(f) of the unemployment extension provisions of the bill we are considering this evening contains language limiting retroactive Pandemic Unemployment Assistance compensation for applicants that had not applied by the date of enactment of this bill.

It is my understanding that this provision is intended to cover individuals who have known for months of their eligibility for benefits but failed to apply in a timely manner. However, it is also my understanding that this provision is not intended to apply in cases where the individuals have only recently learned they would be eligible for PUA and a State unemployment office had previously advised those individuals not to apply for benefits. This is the case, for instance, for secondary schools students in Minnesota, who were advised by the State that they were not eligible for PUA, but a court recently determined that the students were indeed eligible earlier this month.

It is also my understanding that this provision is not intended to apply to individuals who have filed a regular State unemployment insurance claim that remains in adjudication, who later find out that they are ineligible for regular unemployment compensation and must apply for PUA instead.

Senator WYDEN was the lead Democratic negotiator on the unemployment provisions of this bill. Does he share the same understanding of the intent of this provision?

Mr. WYDEN. Yes. That language was not intended to limit retroactive compensation for individuals who were previously advised by a State, that they were ineligible for PUA, nor was it intended to limit retroactive compensation for individuals who have a regular unemployment insurance claim in adjudication and later find out they need to apply for PUA.

Ms. SMITH. Thank you for the clarification and for your work in drafting the unemployment compensation language in this bill.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the inclusion of critical protections for renters in the bill before us today. These include $25 billion in emergency rental assistance and an extension of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's nationwide eviction moratorium through January 31, 2021.

This bill does not include all that I have been calling for since this crisis began, nor is it the bill I would have written on my own, but it is a long overdue and essential start on the help families urgently need to stay or become safely and stably housed right now. And it is arriving as millions of renters across the country are on the precipice of an entirely preventable eviction crisis.

One in five renters are behind on rent right now. For renters in households with children, this number is one in four, and for Black renters, the rate is nearly one in three. Economist Mark Zandi estimates that renters are $70 billion behind on rent, with average back rent of nearly $6,000. With millions of families potentially facing eviction or displacement, without this bill, the current CDC eviction moratorium would have expired on December 31, making for a very unhappy new year for many renters across the country.

A wave of evictions in the middle of this pandemic will set back millions of families, interrupt jobs and educations, and exacerbate inequality in this country. It will also make it harder to keep people healthy and get the virus under control.

I have heard from Ohioans how badly people need housing assistance. A group of Ohio's homeless services organizations told me recently about the tremendous surge in family homelessness they are seeing during the pandemic. One reported that 80 percent of their shelter requests have been families with kids. These are families with nowhere to go and trying to balance work and school. How many of them could have stayed in their homes, and not disrupted their lives—and their kids' lives—if the Federal Government had just stepped in with rental assistance?

In Columbus, there are over 100 eviction trials every day, even with the current CDC moratorium in place. An advocate I spoke with told me that he expected there to be a ''massive flood'' of eviction cases in January after the CDC moratorium expires.

We did not have to be here. Since the passage of the CARES Act in March, I have been calling for more help for renters and homeowners to withstand the COVID–19 pandemic and its economic effects. In May, I introduced S. 3865, the Emergency Rental Assistance and Rental Market Stabilization Act of 2020, to provide these resources throughout the country. The House passed this bill as part of the Heroes Act in May. Unfortunately, Senate Leader MCCONNELL did not see the urgency to act on COVID relief for families, and we are just coming to the floor with a bill to help address the COVID–19 crisis 7 months later.

Today's bill, while not going far enough, takes action to help renters remain or become stably housed and keep their utilities running. The $25 billion in rental assistance and extension of the eviction moratorium will work together to protect renters from evictions in the midst of the pandemic in the middle of winter. The eviction moratorium extension helps prevent evictions while families await assistance. Rental assistance will ensure that families can pay their bills and remain in their homes during and after the pandemic without being forced to make impossible choices between rent and food or medicine.

Given how badly these resources are needed in the community today, the Department of Treasury must do all that it can to implement this rental assistance program quickly and successfully.

This means ensuring that States and communities can quickly provide funds to those who need them and minimize artificial paperwork and documentation barriers for applicants trying to access the funds Congress intended them to have. Treasury should avoid establishing requirements that are burdensome for both renters and grantees administering emergency rental assistance programs and that will slow down dollars going to keep the heat on and pay landlords.

The COVID–19 pandemic has had broad impacts on individuals, families, businesses, availability of government services and supports, and throughout our economy. It has changed where and how many people work. It has made it more difficult not just to keep a job, but also to find a new job, to get enough hours, and to find child care or someone to care for a sick loved one. All of these challenges brought on by the pandemic have made it more difficult for families to make ends meet. These effects are likely to exist for months and years to come. As Congress has stated in this bill, given the enormous documentation challenges facing families as businesses close and service jobs reduce in hours, an applicant's written attestation should be the only documentation required to demonstrate a connection to the pandemic.

In addition to financial assistance for rent, utilities, and other housing costs, the bill permits grantees to fund housing stability services. This will allow grantees to offer households services they may need to remain or become stably housed, including case management, landlord-tenant mediation, legal services, eviction prevention services, rehousing services, services to connect eligible households to other public supports, and referrals to other services for behavioral, emotional, and mental health issues, domestic violence, child welfare, employment, and substance abuse treatment.

Finally, the emergency rental assistance fund in this bill provides nontaxable assistance for renter households that does not count toward income for calculating eligibility for other programs. Emergency assistance is just that—emergency assistance for an extraordinary event—and it should not be used to penalize families further. If there is any confusion about the taxability of this assistance, the Department of Treasury, in consultation with the Internal Revenue Service, should provide guidance to clarify this for grantees and participants.

I will continue to fight for the housing resources and protections our renters and homeowners need to stay in their homes. I also look forward to working to successfully deploy the historic resources and protections provided in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

(Mr. SASSE assumed the Chair.)

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 289 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Alexander	Boozman	Carper
Baldwin	Braun	Casey
Barrasso	Brown	Cassidy
Bennet	Burr	Collins
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Coons
Blunt	Capito	Cornyn
Booker	Cardin	Cortez Masto

Cotton	Kennedy	Sanders
Cramer	King	Sasse
Crapo	Klobuchar	Schatz
Daines	Lankford	Schumer
Duckworth	Leahy	Scott (SC)
Durbin	Loeffler	Shaheen
Ernst	Manchin	Shelby
Feinstein	Markey	Sinema
Fischer	McConnell	Smith
Gardner	Menendez	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Merkley	Sullivan
Graham	Moran	Tester
Grassley	Murkowski	Thune
Harris	Murphy	Tillis
Hassan	Murray	Toomey
Hawley	Perdue	Udall
Heinrich	Peters	Van Hollen
Hirono	Portman	Warner
Hoeven	Reed	Warren
Hyde-Smith	Risch	Whitehouse
Inhofe	Roberts	Wicker
Jones	Romney	Wyden
Kaine	Rosen	Young
Kelly	Rubio	

NAYS—6

Blackburn	Johnson	Paul
Cruz	Lee	Scott (FL)

NOT VOTING—2

Enzi	Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 92, the nays are 6.

The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the motion to concur is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from South Dakota, the senior Senator from Kansas, and the senior Senator from Missouri be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions from December 21, 2020, to January 3, 2021.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING THE UNITED NATIONS WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME ON THE OCCASION OF BEING AWARDED THE 2020 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res 774.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 774) honoring the United Nations World Food Programme on the occasion of being awarded the 2020 Nobel Peace Prize.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Boozman amendment to the resolution be considered and agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the Boozman amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 2733) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the resolving clause)

On page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike ''staff worldwide;'' and insert ''staff, who work tirelessly, and often at great personal risk, to combat hunger and save lives around the world;''.

On page 3, line 3, strike ''nutrition'' and insert ''nutrition, including''.

The resolution (S. Res. 774), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2734) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Beginning in the second whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''Whereas the WFP'' and all that follows through the semicolon in the fifth whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas the WFP is the largest international humanitarian organization that addresses hunger, promotes food security, and saves lives, including in response to many of the most dangerous and complex crises in the world;

Whereas, in 2019, an estimated 135,000,000 people around the world suffered from acute hunger and the WFP provided nutrition assistance to nearly 100,000,000 people in 88 countries;

Whereas the 2020 coronavirus pandemic has contributed to a significant increase in hunger around the world, and the WFP has surged its capacity in order to meet that compounded need;

Whereas the United States played an integral role in the founding of the WFP, remains its strongest supporter, and provides, as of the date of adoption of this resolution, more than 40 percent of its annual resources;

In the seventh whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''Price'' and insert ''Prize''.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 774

Whereas, on October 9, 2020, the Norwegian Nobel Committee announced that the Nobel Peace Prize for 2020 has been awarded to the United Nations World Food Programme (referred to in this preamble as the ''WFP'') ''for its efforts to combat hunger, for its contribution to bettering conditions for peace in conflict-affected areas and for acting as a driving force in efforts to prevent the use of hunger as a weapon of war and conflict'';

Whereas the WFP is the largest international humanitarian organization that addresses hunger, promotes food security, and saves lives, including in response to many of the most dangerous and complex crises in the world;

Whereas, in 2019, an estimated 135,000,000 people around the world suffered from acute hunger and the WFP provided nutrition assistance to nearly 100,000,000 people in 88 countries;

Whereas the 2020 coronavirus pandemic has contributed to a significant increase in hunger around the world, and the WFP has surged its capacity in order to meet that compounded need;

Whereas the United States played an integral role in the founding of the WFP, remains its strongest supporter, and provides, as of the date of adoption of this resolution, more than 40 percent of its annual resources;

Whereas the WFP has stated, ''Until the day we have a medical vaccine, food is the best vaccine against chaos''; and

Whereas the Norwegian Nobel Committee, in announcing the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for 2020, stated, ''The work of the World Food Programme to the benefit of humankind is an endeavour that all the nations of the world should be able to endorse and support'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) joins the other countries of the world in—

(A) affirming the mission of the United Nations World Food Programme (referred to in this resolution as the ''WFP'') on the occasion of being awarded the 2020 Nobel Peace Prize; and

(B) supporting the leadership of the WFP Executive Director, David Beasley, and the contributions of the more than 17,000 WFP staff, who work tirelessly, and often at great personal risk, to combat hunger and save lives around the world; and

(2) remains committed to the goal of the international community to end hunger, achieve food security, and improve nutrition, including through the work of the WFP.

RECOGNIZING THE DEVASTATING EXPLOSION THAT ROCKED THE PORT OF BEIRUT ON AUGUST 4, 2020

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 682 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 682) recognizing the devastating explosion that rocked the Port of Beirut on August 4, 2020, and expressing solidarity with the Lebanese people.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 682) was agreed to.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I further ask that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of August 13, 2020, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

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