

they would finally get ahead, and then COVID hit, and now they are at risk of being evicted and losing their homes that brought their children stability for the first time.

There are the Michigan families who have lost loved ones—more than 7,000 grandmas and grandpas and moms and dads, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, cousins, neighbors, and friends.

People in Michigan aren't talking about a stimulus bill; they want a survival package because it is survival for them right now. Instead, Republicans have introduced a bill that leaves our urgent health care needs, our families, and far too many businesses behind.

This Republican proposal leaves behind the most important thing we need to do right now to get the pandemic under control. President Trump has said that we will wake up one day and COVID-19 will have miraculously gone away. Oh, wouldn't that be great. But we are tired of waiting and getting up every day and being faced with the threat of COVID-19.

If we want people to send their kids to school, reopen their businesses, get back to work, be able to go shopping at their small businesses, to be able to eat at their restaurants, then we need to make sure things are safe. Right now, it is not safe.

COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations and deaths are spiking all across the country. The White House is still resisting a national testing strategy, as if it is some kind of giveaway to Democrats instead of public health 101.

Meanwhile, millions of people have lost their jobs, which means they have also lost their health insurance, which he doesn't want to address, and our healthcare system is under strain. Our hospitals and our nursing homes are still struggling to get enough personal protective equipment for their employees, for families who want to visit, and for patients. Our healthcare professionals are exhausted, stressed, and at severe risk of burnout. Healthcare needs are left behind in this bill, and so are the needs of our families.

Right now, the unemployment rate in Michigan is 8.5 percent—higher than the national average. Since March 15, 2.3 million Michigan residents have relied on unemployment. The extra \$600 a week provided in the CARES Act was a lifeline for these Michigan families, and it needs to be extended so they can have a roof over their heads and pay their bills and survive. A survey last month by the U.S. Census Bureau found that 25 percent of Michigan residents thought they would be evicted or lose their home to foreclosure in the next 2 months.

We need to act now—now. We have an opportunity. The Senate Democratic leader will give us the opportunity to vote on that bill and act now. Without additional unemployment aid and rental assistance, where will these families go in January when the CDC eviction moratorium expires and they are months behind in rent?

This legislation also leaves our children behind. The Republican bills have not provided adequate funding to reopen our schools safely, and millions of parents, including my own daughter and her family and my own son and his family, are juggling, trying to make sure that kids can work online, trying to make sure they are getting the education they need. It is hard.

The money that has been provided in the bill, unfortunately, in the underlying bill—there is some, but it comes with strings attached. Schools must physically reopen in order to receive their fair share of funding. So if your school district has decided that COVID cases have gone up and it is not safe for the children to go back to school—they are still paying the teachers, they are operating remotely, and they have all the costs of operating remotely, but if they are not physically there, as President Trump insists on, physically there regardless of the health risk, they would not get the help they need for our children to be educated—quite a change for a political party that likes to talk about local control.

But there is one exception. If your child is going to a private school, you get a great big tax credit if you send your child to a private school rather than a public school, like the vast majority of children in our country.

Brecken is a 5-year-old kindergarten student in the De Tour area public schools in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. She has access to high-speed internet in only one way, and that is if her parents disconnect every other electronic device in their house while she is doing her studies. And the connection isn't great. Brecken and other students in rural areas deserve the same internet connectivity that their city friends enjoy, but the Republicans leave them behind.

Democrats have proposed a \$4 billion E-rate funding increase to ensure children are able to go to school remotely. We don't want Brecken or any child left behind in this COVID-19 crisis.

We can't talk about schools without talking about healthy food and nutrition. They go hand in hand. The average person getting help right now—food assistance—receives \$127 a month, which is \$1.40 per meal. About 40 percent of our families who are getting even that have gotten absolutely no increased help whatsoever. And we know in the food lines, people who have donated to the food banks all their lives are now sitting in their car for hours sometimes, waiting to go through the food line themselves. Our families need help. Our families are hungry. We can fix that if we pass the bill that the House sent to us.

Finally, this legislation isn't just about leaving critical healthcare needs and testing needs behind, leaving our children and leaving our families behind. It leaves far too many businesses behind. Over the past few months, I have met with so many Michigan business owners, mostly over Zoom—res-

taurants, gyms, entertainment venues, craft jewelry, theaters that have been revitalizing Michigan downtowns. One of the things I love is that not just in big cities but in small towns across Michigan, you will go downtown, and there is now a craft brewery, and then they have rebuilt and revitalized a historic theater, and they are rebuilding the downtown. They have been hit so hard by what has happened with COVID-19. They deserve specific help that they are not getting in this legislation.

All small businesses are not getting the help—the kind of help—that they need. We don't want to leave any small business behind, including our minority-owned small businesses in underserved communities and nonprofits. We fought successfully, as Democrats, to add \$30 billion in dedicated funding for those who are underbanked or receiving their financial support in other nontraditional ways. That is not in here either.

So we need an approach for this pandemic and the economic catastrophe it has unleashed across the country. We need an approach that is serious and is bold—neither of which is what we are about to vote on with this PPP vote—for testing and healthcare, for keeping our children safe so they can get back to school, for our families and all of our businesses.

We know that so many have been hit in ways that are different than others, so we need to address all of our small businesses. This is no time to leave any of them behind, and the Republican initiative in front of us does just that. People deserve better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I do want to say that we are here at a time when the Republican Party is jamming yet another nominee through bizarre procedural practices onto the Supreme Court.

We have examined in the Judiciary Committee some of the ways in which the funding for that operation flows from big anonymous donors who use the Federalist Society as a conduit to buy a seat at the table where our Supreme Court Justices are selected, and then, with contributions as big as \$17 million, pays for campaign ads for the nominee who has been selected and then sends an entire flotilla of front groups in an orchestrated chorus to go and argue together before the Supreme Court as if they were different.

What I want to say today is that we have been looking at this captured court problem for a while, and we are releasing this "What's at Stake" report on what it means for climate and the environment because who is behind the scheme to capture the court are primarily the big polluters who want protection from courts that will be friendly to their interests.

I will speak more about this and about why they are willing to spend

what the Washington Post has calculated as \$250 million in dark money to affect this court-capture operation. What is the payback for them?

I am here for this episode of my "Time to Wake Up" series, which has an interesting overlay with what is happening in the Senate because we are considering the nomination of Judge Barrett to go on the Supreme Court. Her nomination completes a series of three nominations to the Supreme Court consecutively, each of which has been distinguished by extremely unusual procedural maneuvering and even rule-breaking within the Senate and the Judiciary Committee to get those nominations pushed through. So we have been looking for some time at what the motivation is behind all of that pressure and what the explanation is for all of those bizarre procedural anomalies that we see over and over and over again.

As I described in the Judiciary hearing, what we see is an operation that has brought big, anonymous special interests to the table, where Justices are selected by virtue of their writing big checks. The vehicle for this has been the Federalist Society, which has a fine role on college campuses as a conservative discussion and student group and which has a relatively fine role in Washington as a think tank—as fine as think tanks are. Yet it also has this additional role of taking money from big special interests, not disclosing who they are, and giving them a seat at the table when the Federalist Society is selecting Justices, and that is wrong. There is just no doubt about that being wrong.

Then, once the Justices are selected, guess what. Ad campaigns get launched in support of them, and checks get written as big as \$17 million to support the ad campaigns. Again, the donors are anonymous. It is very weird. Then, finally, they get on the Court, and these little flotillas of amici curiae—friends of the court, people who file briefs—come into the Court by the dozen. They don't disclose it in their briefs, but if you dig back a little bit, you will find that many of them have common funding and that the amicus curiae performance before the Court is an orchestrated performance—again, anonymously funded.

So what brings that to today is that Senator MERKLEY has led our effort with this report: "What's at Stake: Climate and the Environment. How Captured Courts Rig the System for Corporate Polluters."

I want to express my appreciation to Senator MERKLEY for his hard work on this report and to his staff for its report. He has been joined by me, TOM UDALL, DEBBIE STABENOW, ED MARKEY, DICK BLUMENTHAL, SHERROD BROWN, BRIAN SCHATZ, and MARTIN HEINRICH. We are proud of this work. This is one of seven follow-on reports to our original Captured Courts report.

One of the things that I pointed out when I was discussing this in the Judi-

ciary Committee was that the Washington Post's investigation into this scheme, which was a fairly robust investigation; I have to give it good marks—tallied up the amount of anonymous money that it could connect to the network of groups that is performing this scheme at \$250 million. This \$250 million is a lot of money. A quarter of a billion dollars is a lot of money. I have people say: No. No. It couldn't possibly be true that they have spent \$250 million on this effort to capture the Court. Who spends that kind of money?

So I want to walk through an example of how this money gets paid back after it is spent, and I will use just one example, one case.

Back in the Obama administration, in order to deal with climate change, the Environmental Protection Agency created a Clean Power Plan to allow different States to set targets for themselves and try to meet those emissions reductions targets. That was challenged in court.

The case went to the Supreme Court, where 5 to 4, with what I call the Roberts Five—no Democrat but the Republican appointees who are actively engaged in this process—did something very unusual. They granted what is called an interlocutory stay. Interlocutory stays are virtually unheard of. In fact, I believe this was actually the first.

So objecting States—primarily States with fossil fuel industries—went to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. They objected to this and asked for a stay, and the DC Circuit said: No. You can appeal the rule, but go through the ordinary process. We are not going to stay it.

They then went running up to the Supreme Court, where the five Republican appointees granted the stay. Again, I don't think that had ever happened before, an interlocutory stay.

So let's do a little bit of math about just that one decision. Let's start with the International Monetary Fund, which is not a green organization by anybody's likes, I don't think, but it is pretty good at financial analysis, and it has come up with a number. In the United States alone—just in the United States—the fossil fuel industry enjoys an annual subsidy of \$600 billion with a "b." That is the IMF's calculation. It is actually a little bit north of that, but I have rounded it to 600 for these purposes, primarily because the industry gets away with not paying for what economists call its negative externalities. They get to pollute for free, and, basically, that is a violation of every rule of market economics.

I do not care how conservative the economist is that you go to. The conservative heroes of economics from the Chicago school have said: Yes, when it is pollution, it should be charged to the polluter and should be baked into the price of the product; otherwise, the market is failing, and you have a subsidy.

So a \$600 billion subsidy every year, and the Clean Power Plan case was in 2016. It was in February of 2016. It is now October of 2020, so more than 4 years have passed. But, again, let me just round it down, and let's say that it has been 4 years. Four years at \$600 billion a year is \$2.4 trillion—\$2.4 trillion.

Let's assume that the Clean Power Plan, had it been implemented, would have reduced the \$600 billion annual subsidy. Let's be really, really, really, really conservative, and let's assume that the effect the Clean Power Plan would have had on the fossil fuel industry would have been to reduce that by 1 percent—just 1 percent. So over those 4 years, that \$2.4 trillion would have been reduced to one one-hundredth of that. One one-hundredth of \$2.4 trillion is \$24 billion. Now, I think the Clean Power Plan would have had a lot more of an effect on this calculation, as companies had to clean up their act, than 1 percent, but I am taking a really low number just to make the point.

Six hundred billion is a little bit low, 4 years is a little bit low, and 1 percent is probably very low, but when you put it together, the mathematics gets you to \$24 billion that the industry saved by being able to go to this court and have it do the unusual thing—the unprecedented thing—of putting a stay on the Environmental Protection Agency.

So if you are comparing—remember where we started on this was how shocking it was that somebody might spend \$250 million in dark money to produce a court that would do unprecedented things like stay the regulation? Well, you do \$250 million into \$24 billion, it is a 100-to-1 return on your investment. Put in a penny, get back dollar. Put in a dollar, get back 100 bucks. Put in \$250 million, get back \$24 billion.

That is assuming this is the only case in which this mattered. As I have pointed out from this desk over and over again, we are now up to 80 cases in which, on a 5-to-4 basis, with a partisan makeup to the 5-to-4 and with a big Republican donor interest at stake, the court has ruled for the big Republican donor interest 80 times. The score is 80 to 0, to be clear. So this is just one of those 80—a big one, mind you. A big one. These are big bucks that are involved but just 1 of those 80.

So don't be surprised when the Washington Post reports that big, big, big corporate interests are willing to put \$250 million into a scheme to pack the courts with judges who will make the "right" decision for the big corporate interests—not once, not twice, not 10 times, but 80 times—because just that one decision alone paid back the whole \$250 million 99 times more. That is what we are up against, and that is why I am so determined to get to the bottom of what is going on, because everybody going into that Supreme Court has a right to an honest decision. Everybody has a right to a court that is deciding cases on their true merits and not because of "conservative activists"

behind-the-scenes campaign to remake the nation's courts in a way that makes people who give \$250 million in dark money the big winners."

Madam President, at this point, I yield to my wonderful colleague Senator MERKLEY, and thank him for his leadership on the "What's at Stake: Climate and the Environment" report that we are speaking about today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, what is at stake with our climate and the environment? Our planet. Our planet is on fire, literally. Historic wildfires are leaving our forests and rural communities in ashes. Oceans are growing hotter and more acidic, devastating sea life from the shellfish of Oregon to the coral reefs of the Great Barrier Reef.

There is so much damage, not just to the natural world but to our tourists and fishing industries, to our forest industry, and to our farming industry, the pillars of our rural economy both in America and around the world. More frequent and more devastating storms damaging crops, flooding cities, destroying coastal communities—the climate crisis is a clear and present danger. We are barreling headfirst at full speed toward catastrophic, irreversible climate chaos, and these special interests that my colleague just spoke about and which we expose in this report are using every tool at their disposal, especially the courts, not to stop the damage but to accelerate the carnage.

It shouldn't be too surprising that they should turn to these strategies. They can't turn to the citizens of the United States because protecting our world is popular among the American people. They favor clean air. They favor clean water. They think our government has a responsibility to protect that air and water and land, and, more broadly, to protect our planet.

In fact, 70 percent of Americans say government is not doing enough to reduce the effects of climate chaos, and they are so right. That is why the fossil fuel companies know that they can't win outright based on their arguments—or certainly not based on their ideas. No one says "I want more lead in my water" or "I want more climate-damaging carbon dioxide or methane in the air."

So what do you do if you can't win fairly? You rig the outcome. You fund bogus research. You spend huge sums with media to publicize that bogus research. You increase your influence through a vast, large legal team. You build a powerful lobbying team on Capitol Hill and every State capital across this Nation. You handpick candidates, and you fund their campaigns. You seek to take over control of an entire political party.

But Members of Congress come and go, and even when the deck is stacked, there is that possibility of a grassroots uprising of American people to over-

turn your carefully laid plans to control the American Government. So what do you do? Strategy No. 7, perhaps the most powerful strategy of all—you bias the courts. Once you get someone on the Federal bench, they are there for life. They can't be tossed out by a vote of the people, and they wield immense influence over the laws and regulations, certainly over our environmental laws and regulations. If you control the courts, especially the Supreme Court—even if you lose the White House, even if you lose the House and Senate, even if you lose all three at once—you have immense power over the laws of our land.

Our Constitution was framed to build a government of, by, and for this people. But with control of the courts, the privileged few—the fossil fuel barons—have created, instead, government by and for the powerful. That is why we saw such a committed effort by our colleagues on this side of the aisle to block President Obama from filling hundreds of open seats on the Federal bench. That is why we saw the theft of the Supreme Court seat for the first time in U.S. history 5 years ago. That is why the present majority leader is obsessed with ramming through more than 200 overwhelmingly White male, life-tenured judges, most of whom weren't chosen for their qualifications but for their rightwing ideology. And it is why 86 percent of Trump's nominees to the Supreme Court and the appellate courts are members of the Federalist Society.

The Federalist Society, created in the 1980s—as described in the book, "The Lie That Binds"—implemented an anti-Democratic policy agenda and political philosophy through a court system impervious to the will of the voters. It started one weekend with 200 conservative students and professors at Yale Law School, including Antonin Scalia, and it grew into the present-day shadowy behemoth promoting lawyers into prominent positions and starring far-right judges at every level of the bench to further corporate control—the powerful and privileged few over the will of the people.

How are they funded? Untold millions from polluters and other corporate interests that benefit from judges who strike down environmental laws and related regulations enacted and pursued by the people.

The Federalist Society is now, under Donald Trump, in charge of judicial nominations. He asked them to give him a list of whom he should nominate, and so it goes. The Federalist Society put Neil Gorsuch on that list, and President Trump nominated him. Justice Gorsuch, who said in the Chevron doctrine, a landmark decision that is the basis of 4 years of administrative and mariner law, which gives courts deference to administrative agencies and reasonable interpretations of statutes—ruled it should be overturned.

The Federalist Society put Brett Kavanaugh on that list, and President

Trump nominated him. Whenever the DC Circuit Court ruled to hold a corporate polluter accountable, Kavanaugh could be counted on to be in opposition of holding that corporation accountable. Observers call him a conservative critic of sweeping environmental regulations and a disaster for the environment.

The Federalist Society put Amy Barrett on that list, and Trump dutifully nominated her. Amy Coney Barrett refused to answer whether climate change is real during her confirmation hearing. Her record is clear. In one case she ruled that a park preservation group couldn't sue to block a construction project in Chicago's Jackson Park. She signed an opinion that reversed the lower court decision that protected wetlands from being developed under the Clean Water Act.

Earthjustice, an environmental nonprofit, remarked that her decision signaled Barrett's willingness to interpret environmental laws of the Clean Water Act narrowly in favor of industry interests—a perfect fit with the goal of the Federalist Society.

The Federalist Society plays the tune, and their nominees dance the dance—the dance for government by and for the powerful and the dance that tramples on government by and for the people.

If President Trump loses reelection and if Republicans lose the Senate majority, still, there is this court with this decision against the environment, against the worker, against civil rights time and time again, and a court that will work to stymie every effort to save our planet.

There is a whole list of similar related positions in the lower courts with similar outcomes—corporate welfare over environmental stewardship, one judge after another after another. They are the examples of the pro-corporation, anti-environmental rulings and Trump-appointed jurists that we feared. They are the kinds of challenges that are going to stand in our way if we fight to undo the damage that this administration and its cabal of extreme rightwing allies have unleashed on our democracy and on our planet. So now we have the responsibility to act.

The report that Senator WHITEHOUSE and I are releasing today—and I applaud him for working so hard to develop this whole set of Captured Courts reports to understand the power behind the shift from government by and for the people to government by and for the powerful, because if you have read the Constitution, if you believe in "We the People," you believe in the spirit of a government that draws its very essence from the people of the United States, not from the cabal of extremely wealthy, extraordinarily White, significantly privileged, enormously powerful individuals trying to be puppet masters and destroy that vision that we so cherish.

That is why we must expose it. That is why we must fight it. That is why we

must reclaim—for the future of every child in America, certainly for the future of our environment here in the United States, certainly for the health of the planet, we must reclaim that vision of government of, by, and for the people.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Go ahead, Senator. I just wanted to see if we are going into the vote now, and, if so, whatever procedural steps you needed to take us into the vote, but I yield to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, shortly, we will be voting on whether or not to extend the Paycheck Protection Program, which has been hugely successful in helping our small businesses keep their employees.

In Maine, three out of four small businesses have received \$2.3 billion in forgivable loans. Most important, these loans have helped to sustain 250,000 jobs in the State of Maine and 50 million jobs nationwide.

A bipartisan group of us—Senator RUBIO, Senator CARDIN, Senator SHAHEEN, and I—put this bipartisan program together in March. We added funding in April, and we extended it in June until August 8.

The pandemic, unfortunately, is still forcing shutdowns and mitigation measures months later. Many of the small businesses that were sustained by their PPP loans are still unable to return to normal operations.

Without more assistance, without being eligible for a second PPP loan, many of the hardest hit small businesses, including our restaurants, our gift shops, our hotels, and our B&Bs, will be forced to close their doors, and, worse yet, lay off their workers. That is why it is so important that we reach bipartisan agreement quickly to provide further assistance to small businesses and nonprofits that have been kept alive by their first PPP loan, that have been able to retain and pay their employees but now are still struggling to survive due to this persistent pandemic.

The amendment that we are about to vote on would provide approximately \$258 billion in funding to allow eligibility for a second PPP loan for the hardest hit small businesses and nonprofits, while also expanding and improving the program in some common-sense ways.

This is all about keeping Americans employed. This amendment is endorsed by the NFIB, the National Restaurant Association, the American Hotel and Lodging Association, the International Franchise Association, HospitalityMaine, the United Fresh Produce Association, the National Fisheries Institute, and the International Foodservice Distributors Association.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this important step to renew and strengthen the PPP program to save our small businesses and their employees' jobs.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

PROTECT ACT—Motion to Proceed

The Senate proceeded to consider the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 554, S. 4675, a bill to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I withdraw the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 554, S. 4675.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The motion is withdrawn.

UIGHUR INTERVENTION AND GLOBAL HUMANITARIAN UNIFIED RESPONSE ACT OF 2019

The Senate proceeded to consider the House message to accompany S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 2652, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell Amendment No. 2680 (to Amendment No. 2652), to improve the small business programs.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to table amendment No. 2680 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Manchin	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Reed	

NAYS—57

Alexander	Gardner	Peters
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeben	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Loeffler	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Warner
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Perdue	Young

NOT VOTING—3

Harris	Paul	Sinema
--------	------	--------

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PROTECT ACT—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 554, S. 4675.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 554, S. 4675, a bill to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to explain to the American people what is happening here on the floor of the Senate. After putting the Senate on pause for over 5 long months, while businesses closed, millions lost their jobs, and hundreds of thousands of Americans died, Leader MCCONNELL is now using this week to hold show votes on coronavirus relief. The vote we just had was not even a real vote. Leader MCCONNELL moved to table the bill, then voted against tabling it. It was a stunt, plain and simple. It goes to show how unserious the Republican process is here on the floor of the Senate. Democrats, by their vote, called it for what it is.

The truth is Leader MCCONNELL is doing these stunts on the floor because there is a hard-right faction in the Republican caucus that doesn't want to pass any bill—any other round of relief. The Republican leader admitted that as many as 20 Republican Senators don't want to vote for anything. One Republican Senator voted not to vote