

expanding nontargeted direct payments. So to ensure the President was comfortable signing the bill into law, the Senate committed to beginning one process that would combine three of the President's priorities: larger direct checks, a repeal of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, and further efforts to review the integrity of our democracy—three of the President's priorities in one Senate process. That was the commitment, and that is what happened yesterday when I introduced text reflecting just what the President had, in fact, requested.

Now House and Senate Democrats want something very different. As they tried to do countless times in the past 4 years, Speaker PELOSI and Leader SCHUMER are trying to pull a fast one on the President and the American people.

First of all, they are hoping everyone just forgets about election integrity and Big Tech. They are desperate to ignore those two parts of President Trump's requests, and you can draw your own conclusions. Even on the question of larger checks, the Democrats have tried to warp what President Trump actually laid out.

Look, it is no secret that Republicans have a diversity of views about the wisdom of borrowing hundreds of billions more to send out more nontargeted money, including to many households that have suffered no loss of income during the crisis. COVID-19 has not affected all households equally—not even close.

It is hardly clear that the Federal Government's top priority should be sending thousands of dollars to, for example, a childless couple making well into six figures who have been comfortably teleworking all year. Our duty is to help get help to the people who actually need help, like we did, to a historic degree, just 4 days ago.

But above and beyond that discussion, the Democratic leaders have broken from what President Trump proposed. They quietly changed this proposal in an attempt to let wealthy households suck up even more money. Speaker PELOSI structured her bill so that a family of four would have to earn more than \$300,000 in order not—not to qualify for more cash. A family of three could pull in \$250,000 per year—a quarter of a million dollars—and still qualify for some money.

Democratic leaders want to call this scheme “survival checks.” Only my friends Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leader could look at households in New York and California who make \$300,000, in households where nobody has been laid off, where earnings have not even dropped during the past year, and conclude these rich constituents of theirs need “survival checks” financed by taxpayer dollars and borrowed money.

Everyone sees the game here. These are the same Democrats who proudly blocked the entire aid package for months because they tried to hold out

their special tax cuts for rich people in rich States. Now they say it is a matter of survival to send another boatload of cash to people making \$300,000, regardless of whether they have experienced any disruption at all this past year.

Even the liberal Washington Post today is laughing at the political left for demanding more huge giveaways with no relationship to actual need. Here is what the Washington Post wrote: “Especially wrongheaded . . . is the progressive left, spearheaded by Sen. BERNIE SANDERS . . . who depicts the \$2,000 as aid to ‘desperate’ Americans despite the huge amounts destined for perfectly comfortable families.”

That is from the editors of the Washington Post.

The Wall Street Journal, usually their opposite number, actually agrees. These nontargeted “checks are unnecessary,” and struggling households can access targeted support like “expanded jobless benefits, food stamps, child-care subsidies and much more.”

The liberal economist Larry Summers, President Clinton's Treasury Secretary and President Obama's NEC Director, says: “There is no good economic argument” for universal \$2,000 checks at this moment. He points out the CARES Act and the brandnew law will already have boosted overall household income, relative to the economy, back to its prepandemic levels, if not higher.

If specific struggling households need still more help after the huge, historic package that was just signed into law 4 days ago has taken effect, then what they will need is smart, targeted aid, not another firehose of borrowed money that encompasses other people who are doing just fine.

So, in my view, colleagues like Senator CORNYN and Senator TOOMEY have pointed this out persuasively. But, more broadly, here is the deal. The Senate is not going to split apart the three issues that President Trump linked together just because Democrats are afraid to address two of them. The Senate is not going to be bullied into rushing out more borrowed money into the hands of the Democrats' rich friends who don't need the help.

We just approved almost a trillion dollars in aid a few days ago. It struck a balance between broad support for all kinds of households and a lot more targeted relief for those who need help the most.

We are going to stay smart; we are going to stay focused; and we are going to continue delivering on the needs for our Nation.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### JUST AND UNIFYING SOLUTIONS TO INVIGORATE COMMUNITIES EVERYWHERE ACT OF 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 480, S. 3985.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 480, S. 3985, a bill to improve and reform policing practices, accountability and transparency.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 3985 AND H.R. 9051

Mr. MCCONNELL. I understand there are two bills at the desk due a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5085) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the additional 2020 recovery rebates, to repeal section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes;

A bill (H.R. 9051), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase recovery rebate amounts to \$2,000 for individuals, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bills on the calendar under provision of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I was prepared this afternoon to speak about the business the Senate must address, and I will do that, but, first, I must respond to the recent announcement by the junior Senator of Missouri that he intends to contest the certified votes of the electoral college when Congress meets to count those votes next week. The process for electing American Presidents is provided in our Constitution and laws.

The process has been followed fully, fairly. The results have been duly certified by the Governors of the States, and they have been reviewed and confirmed by the courts many times over. The result is that Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS won the election by overwhelming margins in both the popular vote and the electoral vote.

The Biden-Harris ticket received more than 81 million votes, more than any ticket in American history. That was over 7 million more votes than Trump-Pence. The Biden-Harris ticket won the electoral college 306 to 232, the very same total that President Trump called a landslide for himself then just 4 years ago.

Since the election process, President Trump and his acolytes have lost more than 50 lawsuits, falsely claiming fraud or other irregularities in the conduct of the 2020 election, including the unanimous decision by the Supreme Court to dismiss a lawsuit brought by the attorney general of Texas and more than half the Republican Members of the House.

Today, we heard from the junior Senator from Missouri that he intends to object to the election results, particularly in Pennsylvania—a State where

the Trump campaign and its allies have brought no fewer than 13 lawsuits and lost every single one, many with Republican judges ruling. There have been only three individuals—three—charged with voter fraud in Pennsylvania, and in each case, the person voted for Trump.

The effort by the sitting President of the United States to overturn the results is patently undemocratic. The effort by others to amplify and burnish his ludicrous claims of fraud is equally revolting. This is America. We have elections. We have results. We make arguments based on fact and reason, not conspiracy and fantasy.

On January 6, Congress will meet to formally recognize the electoral college result. There is a very clear process to handle and dispense with the objections of Members of Congress to the counting of the result, and that is just what we will do—dispense with them. On January 6, Congress will ratify the electoral college's decision that Joe Biden will be President and KAMALA HARRIS will be Vice President. Make no mistake about it—Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS will be sworn in as President and Vice President on January 20.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now let me return to the matters at hand.

Today, the Senate will begin the process of overriding the President's veto on the annual Defense bill. The House has already overridden the veto by a comfortable margin. I expect the Senate to follow suit and enact the NDAA into law over President Trump's evolving and ridiculous objections. Congress has passed the annual Defense bill for 59 years in a row. It is an important opportunity to ensure our defense and security policies reflect the evolving challenges of our world and provide our servicemembers and their families, as well as Defense Department civilians, the support, resources, and training they need. The particular legislation includes a pay raise for troops and provisions that will allow the executive branch to be better postured to identify and deter breaches to America's cyber security. In the wake of the SolarWinds hack, that might be a good policy to enact.

Nonetheless, President Trump vetoed this legislation because it provides for renaming military installations that honor Confederate military leaders or, maybe, because it doesn't address an unrelated social media issue. Think about it for a moment. The President vetoed a pay raise to living American soldiers in order to defend the honor of dead Confederate traitors. Well, the Senate will soon have an opportunity to override the President's objection and do right by those brave Americans who wear the uniform.

As I said yesterday, there are two major issues before the Senate right now—the annual Defense bill and the vital and important effort to send \$2,000 stimulus checks to American

families. There are only a few days left in this session, and the Senate should consider both issues before adjourning.

There is a very simple solution to this dilemma: Leader McConnell should bring both measures up for a vote and let the chips fall where they may. I believe both measures—the defense override and the \$2,000 checks to American families—will pass, but at the very least, the Senate deserves the opportunity for an up-or-down vote on increasing the individual payments to the American people.

At the end of my remarks, I will ask the Senate to set a time tonight for a vote on the House bill to provide \$2,000 checks. The Republican leader objected to a similar request I made yesterday, and it appears he may be considering a different bill that packages stimulus checks with other unrelated and partisan policies.

I want to be very clear about one thing: There is no other game in town besides the House bill. The only way to get the American people the \$2,000 checks they deserve and need is to pass the House bill and pass it now. The House has recessed for the year. Any modification or addition to the House bill cannot become law before the end of this Congress. It is a way to kill the bill. Make no mistake about it: Either the Senate takes up and passes the House bill or struggling American families will not get \$2,000 checks during the worst economic crisis in 75 years.

Over the past few days, the idea of increasing direct payments to the American people has united folks from all points of the political spectrum. I salute the Senator from Vermont for the good job he has done in bringing this forward to the American people's attention. An overwhelming bipartisan majority in the House supports the \$2,000 checks. Senate Democrats strongly support these \$2,000 checks, and our unlikely ally, President Trump, this morning, tweeted: "\$2000 ASAP!" For once, the Democrats agree with something on President Trump's Twitter feed. Let's send \$2,000 ASAP to working Americans who are facing the hardest and darkest days of the pandemic.

After all of the insanity that the Senate Republicans have tolerated from President Trump—his attacks on the rule of law, an independent judiciary, the conduct that led to his impeachment—is this where the Senate Republicans are going to draw the line—with \$2,000 checks to the American people? That is a bridge too far? Please.

For the awareness of my colleagues, we can have this vote tonight and send the bill directly to the President's desk for his signature. We can vote on the NDAA bill tonight and finish the Senate's business before the end of the year. All it takes is our Republican colleagues to consent to a simple vote on the House bill to provide \$2,000 checks to the American people. Yes or no, up or down, do you support sending \$2,000

to the American people or not? Let's have the vote.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 9051

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 9051, a bill received from the House, to increase recovery rebate amounts to \$2,000 for individuals; that the bill be read a third time and passed; 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?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Vermont.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H.R. 9051 AND H.R. 6395

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to concur with what Senator SCHUMER said. What he said goes beyond economics. It goes beyond the desperation that tens of millions of working families are facing. It goes beyond the struggles of the people of Vermont or Kentucky.

Let me just make it clear for the majority leader that 10 out of the poorest 25 counties in the United States of America are located in Kentucky. So my colleague the majority leader might want to get on the phone and start talking to working families in Kentucky and find out how they feel about the need for immediate help in terms of a \$2,000 check per adult. I have the strong feeling that the people of Kentucky will respond no differently than the people of Vermont or New York. The last poll that I saw had 78 percent of the American people saying they wanted and needed that type of help.

This discussion, frankly, is not just about the economic struggling of working families in this country. It is not just about the massive levels of income and wealth inequality. It is about basic democracy.

Now, what we have to do here on the floor, whether it is Senator SCHUMER or Senator McCONNELL or I, is to talk in legalese. That is the language of the U.S. Senate. The stuff sounds pretty complicated to the average person, but all that Senator SCHUMER and I are asking of the majority leader is very simple: Allow the Members of the U.S. Senate to cast a vote. If you want to