We know this will not be the last outbreak, so a 9/11 Commission-style panel is necessary to fix these mistakes going forward and apply the lessons from this pandemic to future crises.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill.

Thank you.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 4139. A bill to encourage support by international financial institutions for a robust global response to the COVID–19 pandemic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 4139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Support for Global Financial Institution Pandemic Response Act of 2020''.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR A ROBUST GLOBAL RESPONSE TO THE COVID–19 PANDEMIC.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICIES AT THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(2)) to use the voice and vote of the United States at that institution—

(A) to seek to ensure adequate fiscal space for world economies in response to the global coronavirus disease 2019 (commonly referred to as ''COVID–19'') pandemic through—

(i) the suspension of all debt service payments to the institution; and

(ii) the relaxation of fiscal targets for any government operating a program supported by the institution, or seeking financing from the institution, in response to the pandemic;

(B) to oppose the approval or endorsement of any loan, grant, document, or strategy that would lead to a decrease in health care spending or in any other spending that would impede the ability of any country to prevent or contain the spread of, or treat persons who are or may be infected with, the SARS–CoV–2 virus; and

(C) to require approval of all Special Drawing Rights allocation transfers from wealthier member countries to countries that are emerging markets or developing countries, based on confirmation of implementable transparency mechanisms or protocols to ensure the allocations are used for the public good and in response the global pandemic.

(2) IMF ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL DRAWING RIGHTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to support the issuance of a special allocation of not less than 2,000,000,000,000 Special Drawing Rights so that governments are able to access additional resources to finance their responses to the global COVID–19 pandemic.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies shall include in the annual report required by section 1701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r) a description of progress made toward advancing the policies described in subsection (a).

(c) TERMINATION.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall have no force or effect after the earlier of—

(1) the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Treasury submits to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report stating that the SARS–CoV–2 virus is no longer a serious threat to public health in any part of the world.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4143. A bill to extend the unemployment insurance provisions of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act for the duration of the economic recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on the main topic this morning, I am proud to support Senator WYDEN and Senator BENNET. As the number of COVID–19 cases accelerates across much of the country, the economic toll of this pandemic continues to fall hard on American families and American workers. Over 33 million Americans—at least one-fifth of the entire workforce—have now applied for unemployment assistance since the pandemic began.

Democrats secured a crucial enhancement of that unemployment assistance in the CARES Act—an extra $600 a week, which, according to a study by Columbia University, prevented as many as 12 million Americans from slipping into poverty. By the end of this month, those emergency unemployment benefits will expire, but unfortunately the high levels of unemployment will not. Without an extension of enhanced benefits, Americans struggling without work will have their legs cut out from under them at the worst possible time, in the middle of a raging pandemic.

I am joining with my colleague, Ranking Member WYDEN of the Senate Finance Committee, to introduce a bill that will serve as both a short-term solution and a bold long-term strategy to keep American workers and the American economy afloat. I thank Senator WYDEN for his help and Senator BENNET for his help. Together, we put together a very strong piece of legislation.

Our bill, the Schumer-Wyden American Workforce Rescue Act, would do something very simple: It would tie the extension of enhanced unemployment benefits to economic data, not arbitrary political deadlines. As long as unemployment remains very high—over 11 percent—the enhanced benefits will stay in place. When unemployment goes down, the benefits will phase out appropriately.

This automatic stabilization for unemployment benefits would be one of the first programs of its kind, but at its core, this policy is basic common sense. When Americans truly need the benefits, the benefits will be there. When the economy gets better, those enhanced benefits will be reduced. The impetus for this legislation is common sense. We should not allow the economic security of the American people to depend on the political whims of the legislatures—Federal or State.

When we passed the CARES Act over 2 months ago, Democrats knew the extra $600 in weekly unemployment assistance was only a temporary salve for struggling Americans. We had hoped the economy would be able to bounce back and unemployment would quickly go down. Clearly, that is not the case today.

Experts are warning us that the economic drag from this crisis will take years, if not a full decade, to fully abate. Further action is very much needed and very, very necessary. But for months, Republicans have doubled and tripled down on their strategy of delaying action on COVID–19 relief legislation. They have kept the American people needlessly wondering if the help they rely on will remain in place much longer.

We need to take the next step and tie unemployment benefits to economic triggers that will ensure that so long as Americans are hurting, a safety net will remain in place—whether it is COVID–19 or any other economic disaster in the future that causes unemployment to rise. That is how you give the American people the kind of peace of mind they need that they will not needlessly fall into poverty this year or next year or the year after.

No doubt, this is a new idea. It would be one of the first programs of its kind. But we need to take this bold step forward to guarantee that the Federal Government effectively serves the American people in times of crisis.

There is a long road ahead before the U.S. economy gets back on its feet. In many parts of the country, States are reimposing restrictions on businesses, restaurants, and other places of employment to halt a renewed spread of the disease. Americans will continue to wonder, when can I get back to work?

I am proud to join my colleagues and champion this legislation to provide unemployment benefits for as long as Americans need them—provide unemployment benefits for as long as Americans need them.

Before I yield, I want to thank my colleague Senator WYDEN for championing this legislation as well. He has been a leading and fierce advocate for this policy in our caucus, and I am both grateful and proud to stand with him this morning. I also thank Senator BENNET, who is always thoughtful and thinking on to the future—one of the first Members to alert this Chamber and the country of the disparities in income and wealth distribution—and has had vital input as well. We thank him.

This policy is smart, it is timely, and it is forward-thinking. So it is no surprise that my colleagues, Senator WYDEN—one of the authors—and Senator BENNET have had great input.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator WYDEN and then Senator BENNET be allowed to speak immediately after me for as much time as they may consume.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to be with Senator SCHUMER to advance the Schumer-Wyden legislative proposal today, and I am very pleased that we are joined by Senator BENNET, a particularly valuable member of the Senate Finance Committee, who has worked on these issues for many, many years.

As Senator SCHUMER outlined, we are talking about a fresh approach as we look to extending supercharged unemployment benefits for as long as our economy suffers under the COVID–19 pandemic. As the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee that produced the $600 extra benefit each week until July 31 and the breakthrough to cover for the first time gig workers and the self-employed and part-timers and others, I am going to take a few minutes to explain why this next step to create a dependable safety net in America is a no-brainer.

We know that tens of millions of Americans are out of work due to COVID–19. The pandemic is, in fact, getting worse. Dr. Tony Fauci yesterday talked about the prospect of having 100,000 new confirmed cases per day nationwide. We don't even want to imagine what the unemployment situation is going to look like with 100,000 new coronavirus cases every day. You cannot have a healthy economy in a country suffering from mass death.

I know the President got up in the Rose Garden and celebrated the last jobs report like it was the greatest news since the end of World War II, but you have to be living in a country club fantasy land to believe this economic crisis is anywhere close to ending.

Tens of millions of Americans today are out of work in States with COVID hotspots. There are reports that people who went back to work in the spring are getting laid off for a second time. The numbers show that it disproportionately harms Black and Hispanic people suffering in this crisis, and the layoffs are hitting those Americans especially hard in industries that pay modest wages. This is a recipe for injustice and for long-term economic hardship. Our proposal is desperately needed because the country is not on a straight line to recovery.

Democrats demanded the supercharged unemployment benefits because workers are not to blame for the crisis. Doctors don't yet have a cure for COVID–19, but the Congress does have a way to address the financial strain of joblessness. That is why Democrats demanded full wage replacement during the negotiations on unemployment benefits in the CARES Act.

Secretary Scalia told those of us negotiating this issue that State UI systems—unemployment systems—were too outdated to make it work anytime soon. These are Federal benefits, but under employment law, the States administer the program and get the benefits out.

We knew that there would be some challenges, and we proposed a simple solution: $600 extra per week across the board, adding up to full wage replacement for the typical worker. It was clear that was the only possibility of getting the supercharged benefits out to millions of workers quickly.

It hadn't been easy. In a number of States, the unemployment systems run on Bronze Age technology. In some other cases—and Leader SCHUMER and I are inquiring into these right now—it is a case of Republican sabotage. That is why, for the long term, it is certainly worth looking at a Federal approach for administering unemployment benefits as a better strategy.

But in today's economic conditions, dealing with the suffering we are seeing right now—the suffering that Tony Fauci talked about yesterday that could hammer this country from sea to shining sea—if you are dealing with today's conditions and you want to get full-wage benefits out on time, there is no alternative to $600 per week across the board. Furthermore, there is no good argument for cutting or eliminating benefits as long as the pandemic is raging and getting worse.

On the one hand, we heard Secretary Scalia and other Republicans repeat the old line. They have been talking against unemployment for ages, and they always say the problem is lazy workers dependent on government are going to drag the economy down by collecting unemployment instead of going back to their jobs.

On the other hand, Republicans have repeatedly said the economy is roaring back to full employment so there is no need for extending benefits any longer. You can't have it both ways. You can't have it both ways, that these workers are dragging the economy down and then talk about how everything is booming.

Regardless of how these arguments conflict, neither one holds any water to begin with. I believe it is an insult to American workers to say they would rather sit at home than work hard and earn their pay. Our workers have a strong working ethic, and how could anybody believe in the greatness of America, as the President is always talking about, and think so little of its workers?

Second, it is time to quit pretending to know whether the crisis is anywhere near over. The number of people filing new unemployment claims every week, even now, is two and three times higher than the worst single week of the Great Recession.

Senators have a right to stake out whatever ground they want on this issue. I will tell you, the American people overwhelmingly support extending supercharged unemployment benefits. You see it in polls—polls done by centrist organizations. But more importantly, you hear about it when you are home.

Americans don't buy Secretary Scalia's line about lazy workers or dependence on the government. I can tell you, based on the conversations I had with Oregonians, they don't want any handouts. They understand the country is facing a severe historic crisis of joblessness, and they want the Congress to act. You cannot have a healthy economy in a country suffering from mass debt, particularly in the middle of a pandemic.

It would be an act of sabotage and, I think, unthinkable cruelty to slash these benefits and send all these jobless families into destitution. That is why Senator SCHUMER and I have outlined this proposal to extend these supercharged unemployment benefits in a manner that is tethered to economic conditions on the ground.

We always hear our colleagues talk about policies and the need for policies that really mirror what is going on in the real-world economy, in the private sector. That is what this proposal does. This proposal says we are going to tie the economic benefits; we are going to tether them to economic conditions on the ground.

I saw our colleague from South Dakota, a Member of the Republican leadership, Senator THUNE, say that maybe the benefits ought to taper down when unemployment goes down. I looked at that, and I said that Democrats share that view. That is what our trigger proposal is all about. You have to have them in a way that is going to make sure people can pay rent and groceries, which is what the $600 benefit made possible and will in the future.

But when unemployment tapers down, then, under our proposal, we make an accommodation for that. What we are going to do is common sense. It provides certainty and predictability for American workers, but it will also send a message across the country that there is a policy that will make a more dependable safety net. Yet it will also do what the head of the Federal Reserve just said, which is to make sure that family budgets, which are the ones that drive the American economy, are ones where people can pay the rent and buy groceries.

The bottom line is we have a moral obligation to not turn our back on those who are suffering. I am telling you, the Senate is going to go home here in a day or so for several weeks, and Senators are going to hear loud and clear that workers are concerned about whether, after July 31, they are going to be able to pay the rent and be able to buy groceries. I think they are worried, and I hear it from all parts of my community—about a tsunami of evictions and people simply not being able to feed their families. I think

those who disagree with the Schumer-Wyden proposal ought to come out here and say what they going to offer those people who are hurting.

Influential objective thinkers about the economy, like Jerome Powell, are saying that these kinds of benefits are absolutely key to making sure that the family budget, which drives the American economy, is going to be positioned to pay the rent and buy groceries.

I gather from Leader SCHUMER's remarks that I can yield to our Senator from Colorado, a particularly valuable member of the Finance Committee, who has been working on safety net issues for many, many years.

Mr. BENNET. I would like to thank Leader SCHUMER and the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN, for bringing this commonsense proposal to the floor.

I have long advocated for the idea that we should tie benefits to the conditions of the economy rather than simply politically convenient dates or inconvenient dates that don't matter, don't make any sense to working people in our country, and create idiotic fights here that don't help the people we all have been sent here, in theory at least, to serve.

Right now, we are facing an unprecedented set of conditions in our country. We are being racked by an economic downturn. It is different from any that we have ever seen before and at the same time, we are facing this incredible health crisis. One in six workers in this country is unemployed. One in six workers is unemployed today.

But for once, thankfully, we were able to come together in a bipartisan way in March and pass the CARES Act, which is benefitting these workers in two ways.

First, we expanded unemployment benefits to cover almost 10 million self-employed workers, gig workers, and others who are usually left behind in circumstances like this. That is something we should have changed a long time ago, but we finally got it done, and we did it in a bipartisan way.

Second, as Leader SCHUMER and Senator WYDEN said, we added $600 per week to normal unemployment benefits for all 30 million workers claiming benefits. That $600 weekly benefit has prevented a level of severe hardship that is almost impossible to describe. It has paid rent and prevented evictions. It has kept food on the table so families don't go hungry. It has kept the lights on and paid for the internet so our kids can learn. The bottom line is that the $600 weekly payment has been an essential lifeline to families in the middle of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

In Colorado alone, over 450,000 workers are receiving the expanded benefit, and it has put a total of nearly $2.5 billion into our economy. Nationwide, the numbers are staggering. One analysis showed that these additional payments help keep 12 million Americans out of poverty and keep poverty rates from rising. Without these payments, wages across the entire economy would have declined by 10 percent from February to May. We completely offset that decline.

You know what that means is that working people actually were able to continue to buy things in this economy. The leader might be interested to know that I was talking to an economist recently, Raj Chetty, from Harvard, who has done a study, including other places, of New York. That study shows that the biggest loss in terms of consumer spending has come from the wealthiest areas in New York. That resulted in the biggest unemployment.

In other words, if you have a small business in a wealthy area in New York, your small business is cratering because wealthy people aren't spending money on services because they are scared of getting COVID.

In other parts of New York, there has been much less destabilization, and that is because of these unemployment benefits—directly because of these unemployment benefits—because where the unemployment rate has gone up, people's incomes have been able to be stable.

I am the first to say that not everything we have done with the CARES Act has been perfect. As we know, the CARES Act left out too many families, and too many States have been too slow to get these benefits out. That is the result of delivering benefits through 50 different systems that have been underfunded and undermined for 50 years. But once they have gotten out, these benefits have made a transformational difference. Everyone in the Senate should be proud of that.

I come out here all the time and complain how terrible this place is. I was amazed to hear the majority leader this morning talk about the ''incompetence'' of local officials. There is no body in the world more incompetent than this Senate. But here is a moment when we can actually be proud of something that we did here. Even President Trump has been running campaign ads touting these benefits. Even as he is running these ads—which, as Senator WYDEN said, he is running because this unemployment benefit is popular—he is threatening the take away the benefit by allowing the $600 to sunset at the end of July. That would be a profound mistake.

Right now, even with these enhanced benefits in place, 17 percent of American families can't cover 3 months of basic expenses. Without the extra benefits, that number wouldn't be 17 percent. It would be 43 percent, almost half of the families in our country. Today, nearly 10 percent of Americans can't make the rent. Without the extra benefits, that number would double or triple.

If we let these benefits expire, we are going to throw tens of millions of Americans who rely on them into a profound financial crisis. We will be cutting their monthly income by $2,400. If we go over that cliff and completely cut off benefits, not only will it cut incomes by 50 percent or 60 percent or 70 percent for literally millions of Americans who can't go back to work, but it will cause extreme damage to the economy.

Nothing has kept our economy afloat more than this investment in unemployment. Allowing these benefits to expire would remove $50 billion a month from the economy, reducing the GDP by 2.5 percent in the second half of this year. That would lead to 2 million jobs lost and a significant increase in the unemployment rate. So we would be right back here again. We shouldn't be doing that, at this point, with this very fragile economy and when COVID–19 is spreading in far too many places.

Some of the industries are facing extreme crises in my State as well as across the country. Hotels are projected to suffer revenue losses of almost 60 percent in 2020. Between March and May 2020, total restaurant sales were down more than $94 billion from expected levels, and 90 percent of independent concert venues are at risk of permanently closing down in a few months without receiving additional relief. We can't tell people who are working in all of these industries—when there is no way these businesses will even be close to being 100 percent in the near future—that they are just on their own.

That is why we need to pass an expanded unemployment benefit that continues after July. We should tie that expanded benefit to the unemployment rate, as Senator SCHUMER and Senator WYDEN have designed, so that it steps the benefit down as the economy heals. That makes sense. Nobody here wants to be in a place at which the unemployment benefit disincentivizes people from working, which is why they step it down, but it needs to stay in place until this economy heals.

It is the wrong approach for the country and for the working people in this country to send them over the cliff right now, and it will be the wrong approach to send them over the cliff in 6 months or even in 2 years if the unemployment rate is still elevated. We need to extend expanded unemployment benefits, and we need to do it until the economy recovers. It is the right thing for the workers and families who are wondering how they are going to get through one of the most difficult challenges of their lives. It is the right thing to do for the broader economy in order for it to come back as strongly as it can as we work toward a vaccine.

I thank my colleagues again for their tremendous leadership. I hope that we will be able to work on this in a bipartisan way, as we did before, and that we will be able to pass these extensions for the American people.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 4143

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TILE.—This Act may be cited as the ''American Workforce Rescue Act of 2020''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Extension of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.
Sec. 3. Extension and expansion of the pandemic emergency unemployment compensation program.
Sec. 4. Extension of pandemic unemployment assistance.
Sec. 5. Extension of additional unemployment compensation provisions.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 2104(e) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An agreement entered into under this section shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

''(A) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

''(B) ending on or before the applicable end date described in paragraph (2).

''(2) APPLICABLE END DATE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The applicable end date described in this paragraph with respect to a State is the date that is 13 weeks after the first date (after the date the State entered into an agreement under this section) that the State is not in an extended benefit period described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given day, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(ii) such section 203(f)—

''(I) were applied by substituting '6.0' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.''.

(b) REVISION OF AMOUNT.—Section 2104(b) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting ''(or, for weeks of unemployment beginning after July 31, 2020, and ending on or before the applicable end date described in subsection (e)(2) the amount described in paragraph (3))'' after ''$600''; and

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

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

''(A) TIERS.—The amount described in this paragraph is, with respect to a State, the following amount:

''(i) FIRST TIER AMOUNT.—In the case of weeks beginning in a first tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(i), $100.

''(ii) SECOND TIER AMOUNT.—In the case of weeks beginning in a second tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(ii), $200.

''(iii) THIRD TIER AMOUNT.—In the case of weeks beginning in a third tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(iii), $300.

''(iv) FOURTH TIER AMOUNT.—In the case of weeks beginning in a fourth tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(iv), $400.

''(v) FIFTH TIER AMOUNT.—In the case of weeks beginning in a third tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(v), $500.

''(vi) SIXTH TIER AMOUNT.—In the case of weeks beginning in a fourth tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(vi), $600.

''(B) HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT PERIODS.—

''(i) FIRST TIER.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), a first tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(II) such section 203(f)—

''(aa) were applied by substituting '6.0 percent but less than 7.0 percent' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(ii) SECOND TIER.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), a second tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(II) such section 203(f)—

''(aa) were applied by substituting '7.0 percent but less than 8.0 percent' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(iii) THIRD TIER.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), a third tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(II) such section 203(f)—

''(aa) were applied by substituting '8.0 percent but less than 9.0 percent' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(iv) FOURTH TIER.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iv), a fourth tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(II) such section 203(f)—

''(aa) were applied by substituting '9.0 percent but less than 10.0 percent' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(v) FIFTH TIER.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(v), a fifth tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(II) such section 203(f)—

''(aa) were applied by substituting '10.0 percent but less than 11.0 percent' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(vi) SIXTH TIER.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(vi), a sixth tier high unemployment period described in this clause is, with respect to a State, any period during which an extended benefit period would be in effect for the State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(I) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(II) such section 203(f)—

''(aa) were applied by substituting '11.0 percent' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(bb) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(C) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(i) MINIMUM PERIOD ON A TIER BEFORE MOVING TO A LOWER TIER.—Once a State is in a high unemployment period tier described in clause (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), or (vi) of subparagraph (B), the State may not move to a lower high unemployment period tier (resulting in a lower dollar amount under subparagraph (A)) before the State has been in the existing high unemployment period tier for a period of at least 13 consecutive weeks.

''(ii) DEEMED FIRST TIER.—For purposes of determining the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation during the 13-week period described in subsection (e)(2)(A) with respect to a State, the State shall be deemed to be in a first tier high unemployment period described in subparagraph (B)(i) during such period.''.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 2107(g) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), an agreement entered into under this section shall apply, with respect to a State, to weeks of unemployment—

''(A) beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into; and

''(B) ending on or before the applicable end date described in paragraph (2).

''(2) APPLICABLE END DATE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The applicable end date described in this paragraph with respect to a State is the later of—

''(i) March 27, 2021; or

''(ii) if, as of the date under clause (i), the State is in an extended benefit period described in subparagraph (B), the first date after the date under clause (i) that the State is not in an extended benefit period described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given day, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(ii) such section 203(f)—

''(I) were applied by substituting '5.5' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(3) TRANSITION FOR AMOUNT REMAINING IN ACCOUNT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in the case of an individual who has amounts remaining in an account established under subsection (b) as of the last day of the last week (as determined in accordance with the applicable State law) ending on or before the date described in paragraph (1)(B), pandemic emergency unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual from such amounts for any week beginning after such date for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this section.

''(B) LIMITATION.—No compensation shall be payable by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after the date that is 4 months after the date described in paragraph (1)(B).''.

(b) EXPANSION.—Section 2107(b) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

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

''(3) FIRST-TIER PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—The amount established in an account under paragraph (1) shall be equal to 13 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount, which includes the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation under section 2104, for the benefit year.

''(4) SECOND-TIER PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If, at the time that the amount added to an individual's account under paragraph (3) (in this section referred to as 'first-tier pandemic emergency unemployment compensation') is exhausted, or at any time thereafter, such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under subparagraph (B)), such account shall be augmented by an amount (in this section referred to as 'second-tier pandemic emergency unemployment compensation') equal to 13 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount, which includes the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation under section 2104, for the benefit year.

''(B) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given time, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(ii) such section 203(f) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(C) LIMITATION.—The account of an individual may be augmented not more than once under this subsection.

''(5) THIRD-TIER PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If, at the time that the amount added to an individual's account under paragraph (4) is exhausted, or at any time thereafter, such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under subparagraph (B)), such account shall be augmented by an amount (in this section referred to as 'third-tier pandemic emergency unemployment compensation') equal to 13 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount, which includes the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation under section 2104, for the benefit year.

''(B) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given time, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(ii) such section 203(f)—

''(I) were applied by substituting '7.5' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(C) LIMITATION.—The account of an individual may be augmented not more than once under this subsection.

''(6) FOURTH-TIER PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If, at the time that the amount added to an individual's account under paragraph (5) is exhausted, or at any time thereafter, such individual's State is in an extended benefit period (as determined under subparagraph (B)), such account shall be augmented by an amount (in this section referred to as 'fourth-tier pandemic emergency unemployment compensation') equal to 13 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount, which includes the amount of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation under section 2104, for the benefit year.

''(B) EXTENDED BENEFIT PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a State shall be considered to be in an extended benefit period, as of any given time, if such a period would then be in effect for such State under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) if—

''(i) section 203(f) of such Act were applied to such State (regardless of whether the State by law had provided for such application); and

''(ii) such section 203(f)—

''(I) were applied by substituting '8.5' for '6.5' in paragraph (1)(A)(i) thereof; and

''(II) did not include the requirement under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) thereof.

''(C) LIMITATION.—The account of an individual may be augmented not more than once under this subsection.

''(7) COORDINATION OF PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION WITH REGULAR COMPENSATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If—

''(i) an individual has been determined to be entitled to pandemic emergency unemployment compensation with respect to a benefit year;

''(ii) that benefit year has expired;

''(iii) that individual has remaining entitlement to pandemic emergency unemployment compensation with respect to that benefit year; and

''(iv) that individual would qualify for a new benefit year in which the weekly benefit amount of regular compensation is at least either $100 or 25 percent less than the individual's weekly benefit amount in the benefit year referred to in clause (i),

then the State shall determine eligibility for compensation as provided in subparagraph (B).

''(B) DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—For individuals described in subparagraph (A), the State shall determine whether the individual is to be paid pandemic emergency unemployment compensation or regular compensation for a week of unemployment using one of the following methods:

''(i) The State shall, if permitted by State law, establish a new benefit year, but defer the payment of regular compensation with respect to that new benefit year until exhaustion of all pandemic emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in subparagraph (A)(i).

''(ii) The State shall, if permitted by State law, defer the establishment of a new benefit year (which uses all the wages and employment which would have been used to establish a benefit year but for the application of this subparagraph), until exhaustion of all pandemic emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in subparagraph (A)(i).

''(iii) The State shall pay, if permitted by State law—

''(I) regular compensation equal to the weekly benefit amount established under the new benefit year; and

''(II) pandemic emergency unemployment compensation equal to the difference between that weekly benefit amount and the weekly benefit amount for the expired benefit year.

''(iv) The State shall determine rights to pandemic emergency unemployment compensation without regard to any rights to regular compensation if the individual elects to not file a claim for regular compensation under the new benefit year.''.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

Section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)(ii), by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)''; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) LIMITATION ON DURATION OF ASSISTANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The total number of weeks for which a covered individual may receive assistance under this section shall not exceed 39 weeks and such total shall include any week for which the covered individual received regular compensation or extended benefits under any Federal or State law, or pandemic emergency unemployment compensation under section 2107, except that if after March 27, 2020, the duration of extended benefits, or pandemic emergency unemployment compensation under section 2107 is extended, the 39-week period described in this paragraph shall be extended by—

''(i) the number of weeks that is equal to the number of weeks by which the extended benefits were extended; and

''(ii) in the case of an extension of pandemic emergency unemployment compensation under section 2107, by the number of weeks that is equal to the additional number of weeks (through augmentation) available

with respect to the State in which the individual resides under paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of section 2107(b).

''(B) EXTENSION OF ASSISTANCE.—For the purpose of an extension of the 39-week period under subparagraph (A), the following rules shall apply:

''(i) TRANSITION PERIOD.— Section 2107(g)(3) shall apply to any extension of assistance under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) ACCOUNTS AND GRANDFATHERING.—In determining the number of weeks available for a covered individual under an extension described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the Secretary shall apply rules that are similar to the rules described in paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of section 2107(b), including with respect to accounts and grandfathering.'';

(2) in subsection (h), by striking ''section 625'' each place it appears and inserting ''part 625''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) UNEMPLOYMENT RATE CALCULATION FOR CERTAIN TERRITORIES.—In the case of Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau, the following rules shall apply:

''(1) For the purposes of subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii) of this section, the Secretary shall determine the total unemployment rate of the territory in a manner similar to the manner under section 2107(g)(2).

''(2) For the purpose of subsection (c)(2)(B) of this section, the Secretary shall determine the total unemployment rate of the territory in a manner similar to the manner under paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of section 2107(b).

''(3) For the purpose of subsection (d)(2) of this section, the Secretary shall determine the total unemployment rate of the territory in a manner similar to the manner under section 2104(b)(3)(B).''.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF ADDITIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROVISIONS.

(a) EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF FOR GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 903(i)(1)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1103(i)(1)(D)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act)''.

(b) TEMPORARY FULL FEDERAL FUNDING OF THE FIRST WEEK OF COMPENSABLE REGULAR UNEMPLOYMENT FOR STATES WITH NO WAITING WEEK.—Section 2105(e)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)''.

(c) TEMPORARY FINANCING OF SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION PAYMENTS IN STATES WITH PROGRAMS IN LAW.—Section 2108(b)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)''.

(d) TEMPORARY FINANCING OF SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION AGREEMENTS.—Section 2109(d)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)''.

(e) WAIVER OF THE 7-DAY WAITING PERIOD FOR BENEFITS UNDER THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT.—Section 2112(a) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2)''.

(f) TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR STATES WITH ADVANCES.—Section 1202(b)(10)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1322(b)(10)(A)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act)''.

(g) FULL FEDERAL FUNDING OF EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR A LIMITED PERIOD.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4105 of the Emergency Unemployment Insurance Stabilization and Access Act of 2020 (contained in division D of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (Public Law 116–127)) are each amended by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''the applicable end date described in section 2107(g)(2) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act)''.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 4148. A bill to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 4148

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–254; 6 U.S.C. 621 note) is amended by striking ''July 23, 2020'' and inserting ''July 27, 2023''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

SENATE RESOLUTION 640—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION ON PRECISION-GUIDED MUNITIONS

Mr. ROUNDS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 640

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Department of Defense has cooperated extensively with Israel to assist in the procurement of precision-guided munitions, and such cooperation represents an important example of robust United States support for Israel;

(2) to the extent practicable, the Secretary of Defense should take further measures to expedite deliveries of precision-guided munitions to Israel; and

(3) regularized annual purchases of precision-guided munitions by Israel, in accordance with existing requirements and practices regarding the export of defense articles and defense services, coordinated with the United States Air Force annual purchase of precision-guided munitions, would enhance the security of both the United States and Israel by—

(A) promoting a more efficient use of defense resources by taking advantage of economies of scale;

(B) enabling the United States and Israel to address crisis requirements for precision-guided munitions in a timely and flexible manner; and

(C) encouraging the defense industrial base to maintain routine production lines of precision-guided munitions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 641—DESIGNATING APRIL 13, 2020, AS ''NATIONAL BORINQUENEERS DAY''

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES 641

Whereas, in 1898, Puerto Rico became a territory of the United States and, the following year, Congress authorized raising a military unit of volunteer soldiers on the island, which was organized as the ''Puerto Rico Regiment of Volunteer Infantry'';

Whereas, in 1908, Congress incorporated the regiment as part of the regular United States Army as the ''Puerto Rico Regiment of Infantry'';

Whereas, in 1917, after the United States' entry into World War I, the Puerto Rico Regiment of Infantry was sent to Panama to defend the Panama Canal Zone;

Whereas, in 1920, Congress redesignated the unit as the 65th Infantry Regiment of the United States Army;

Whereas during World War II, the 65th Infantry Regiment served in North Africa and Europe, including combat operations in France and Germany for which members of the unit received commendations for valiant service, including 1 Distinguished Service Cross, 2 Silver Stars, 2 Bronze Stars, and 90 Purple Hearts;

Whereas, in 1950, the 65th Infantry Regiment deployed to South Korea, and during the voyage the soldiers nicknamed the unit the ''Borinqueneers'', a reference to the native Taíno Tribe's name for the island of Puerto Rico;

Whereas during the Korean War, the 65th Infantry Regiment (hereinafter, the ''Borinqueneers'') engaged in substantial combat operations on the Korean Peninsula, and the unit played a central role in several important offensives and counter-offensives that earned it well-deserved admiration and commendation;

Whereas the Borinqueneers' extraordinary service during the Korean War resulted in the Regiment receiving 2 Presidential Unit Citations (Army and Navy), 2 Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Citations, a Meritorious Unit Commendation (Army), a Navy Unit Commendation, the Chryssoun Aristion Andrias (Bravery Gold Medal of Greece), and campaign participation credits for United Nations Offensive, Chinese Communist Forces (CCF) Intervention, First United Nations Counteroffensive, CCF Spring Offensive, United Nations Summer-Fall Offensive, Second Korean Winter, Korea Summer-Fall 1952, Third Korean Winter, and Korea Summer 1953;

Whereas the Borinqueneers' extraordinary service during the Korean War also resulted in numerous individual commendations and awards for its soldiers, including 1 Medal of Honor, 9 Distinguished Service Crosses, more than 250 Silver Stars, more than 600 Bronze Stars, and more than 2,700 Purple Hearts;