

able to come back, and the business you had to leave can reassemble itself quickly after, God willing, this crisis ends.

The bill still includes something that most Americans don't want to see: large corporate bailouts with almost no strings attached. Maybe the majority leader thinks it is unfair to have protections for workers and labor to companies that are getting hundreds of billions of dollars. We think it is very fair to ask for those. Those are not extraneous issues. That is a wish list for workers—nobody else.

We are looking for protection. We are looking for oversight. If this Federal Government is making a big loan to someone—to a big company, we ought to know it and know the details immediately. The bill that was put on the floor by the Republican leader said no one would know a thing about those loans for 6 months at least. In those so-called bailouts, we need to protect workers—the workers those industries employ.

We have been guided by one plan: workers first. That is the name of our proposal. The bill needs to reflect that priority.

We are working on all of these items in good faith as we speak, and we hope and expect to conclude negotiations today. This vote the Senate—it is no surprise—is about to take is merely a repeat of the vote that failed last night. Leader MCCONNELL continues to set arbitrary vote deadlines when the matter of real importance is the status of the bipartisan negotiations.

Let me be clear. The upcoming procedural votes are essentially irrelevant. The negotiations continue no more than 30 feet away from the floor of the Senate in our offices, where the real progress is taking place. Once we have an agreement that everyone can get behind, we are prepared to speed up the consideration of that agreement on the floor. So I am going to get back to negotiations.

We all know time is of the essence. The country is facing twin crises in our healthcare system and in our economy. We have an obligation to get the details right and get them done quickly. That doesn't mean blindly accepting a Republican-only bill. That was the bill we were given. There were lots of things we didn't even know about on Saturday. That means working to make this bill better—better for our small businesses, better for our working families, better for our healthcare system.

Democrats—Democrats—will not stop working with our Republican counterparts until we get the job done. I will continue to update the Senate on the progress of our negotiations.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. I object. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader's objection is heard. Ms. COLLINS. This is unbelievable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maine be allowed to speak for a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a quorum call.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader's objection is heard.

Mr. COTTON. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader's objection is heard. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would simply like to know for the sake of the Members—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a quorum call.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RISCH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a quorum call.

Is there an objection to removing the quorum call?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to removing the quorum call?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no right to reserve the right to object.

Mr. SCHUMER. I have the floor. I would ask—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, you do not.

The Senate is in a quorum call. You have to ask that the quorum call—

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would simply like to ask the leader—before we have these speeches, because we were supposed to vote for the next time after he and I spoke—what is the schedule for the rest of the day?

Will he respond?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that they are going to let us voice vote this.

Mr. SCHUMER. We have no objection to voice voting the first two and then would like to vote, if the leader wants, now on the third, and then we can have the speeches.

Mr. MCCONNELL. What you are proposing is that we voice vote two, and then the cloture vote occurs automatically?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Parliamentary inquiry: Does the cloture vote occur—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The cloture vote pops and occurs third automatically.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I propose we voice vote the first two and then pause so that there are some speeches allowed by Members—up to an hour of speeches allowed by Members before the cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. I have no objection to that. As long as we have a schedule, I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding of the Chair is that there will be voice votes on the first two motions, and then there will be an hour of debate equally divided. There will be an hour of debate prior to a vote on the cloture motion upon reconsideration.

Mr. MANCHIN. Equally divided? An hour on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding of the Chair is that the request is that the hour of debate would be equally divided prior to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MIDDLE CLASS HEALTH BENEFITS TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2019—Motion to Proceed—Resumed

MOTION TO RECONSIDER—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 748.

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

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 748.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now an hour of debate equally divided under the previous order.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I also ask that the vote be 30 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The vote will be 30 minutes in length. It is so ordered.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, we are in the midst of a crisis in our country—a crisis caused by the coronavirus. I cannot believe that the answer to this crisis from our friends on the other side of the aisle, as we move to address the economic consequences that are so severe for the people of this country, is delay, delay, delay; no sense of urgency; no hurry.

I will tell you, I have had the honor to serve in this body for many years. Never—never—have I seen Republicans and Democrats fail to come together when confronted with a crisis. We did so after 9/11. We did so with the financial meltdown in 2008. Here, we are facing an enemy that is invisible but equally devastating to the health of our people and to the health of our economy. Yet, unbelievably, the Democratic leader objected to my even being able to speak this morning. Is that what we have come to? The Democratic leader objected to our convening at 9 o'clock this morning so that we could begin working in earnest. Is that what we have come to?

The fact is, we have been working on a bipartisan effort through task force, with both Republicans and Democrats, making very good progress and putting together a comprehensive package—the third package we have dealt with. This one is to address and prevent the economic devastation that is being caused by this virus.

We don't have another day. We don't have another hour. We don't have another minute to delay acting. I have talked with businesses all over my State—small mom-and-pop businesses, like a diner, a third-generation diner operated by the Simones family in Lewiston, ME. For the first time ever, they have had to close their doors. As Linda Simones told me through tears yesterday: This is the first time ever we have been unemployed. Our son is unemployed. Our friends who have worked with us at this diner for years are unemployed.

We have a very good plan that we worked on in a bipartisan way—Senator MARCO RUBIO and I on the Republican side and Senators BEN CARDIN and JEANNE SHAHEEN, in very good faith, on the Democratic side—that would help these small businesses and keep their employees paid. It would keep their employees getting paychecks. How can that possibly be controversial?

How can any of us want to see millions of Americans lose their paychecks, their health insurance, their contributions to their retirement plans? We have a package that is part of this broader legislation.

As the majority leader pointed out just yesterday, had we invoked cloture, that is not the end of the process. There still could have been 30 hours for us to refine this package.

Keep in mind that every single one of these task forces have been bipartisan. Do we agree on everything? Of course not, but surely, surely, in this time of extreme crisis for our country—when people are getting sick, when people are dying from the coronavirus, when we are facing unemployment rates which could go as high as 20 percent, according to the Treasury Secretary—surely, we ought to be able to pull together and work quickly to respond to the needs of the American people.

I cannot believe the objections to proceeding to this package. Is this package perfect? No. That is why negotiations are still going on.

Don't we want to act quickly to provide relief to the American workers? This is disgraceful. We do not have time. Time is not on our side. Let's get the job done for the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise because my dear friend, I can tell, is very upset. I am upset that we are at this point. I really am. I am working with you on so many things in a bipartisan way. I always have and always will.

With that being said, let me make sure of this. I haven't been here as long as you have and haven't the experience that you have. The way I understand it, voting for cloture takes a 60-vote threshold, except for the judges, which, basically, the previous leader, Senator Harry Reid from Nevada, changed. I was opposed to that. We are in a situation now where, if you vote yes on cloture and then you are not in agreement with the bill, it only takes 51 votes. That seems to be the reason everyone is saying: Wait a minute. Let's get an agreement so we can move it through.

That is what I always heard and that is what I understand. They are afraid, basically, that if you vote for cloture—even though it is not the things you want or have been negotiated on—then the vote is 51, even with the 30 hours of curing. Then, it goes from there, and, then, we are back to where we have not had any negotiations because the majority has the control with 51 votes. That is what I think the fear is here.

The problem we have in West Virginia right now is that you can throw all the money at Wall Street that you want to. You can continue to put trillions upon trillions there. People are afraid to leave their home. They are afraid because they are afraid of the healthcare. I have workers who don't have masks. I have healthcare workers who don't have gowns. I have hospitals that will not be open another 60 days because they don't have cash flow. It looks like we are worried more about the economy than the healthcare and well-being of the people.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANCHIN. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Even if cloture were invoked, there are 30 more hours.

Mr. MANCHIN. We know about the 30 more hours.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask the Senator from West Virginia, in what way would your side be disadvantaged by that?

The American people are waiting for us to act today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Senator COLLINS has laid it out. We don't have time for this. We don't have time for it.

Mr. MANCHIN. Let me ask you a question.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a question. In what way would the Democratic minority be disadvantaged?

Mr. DURBIN. Who has control of the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. MANCHIN. Sir, anything I am saying—30 hours or 30 days—as long as you have the majority, 51 votes rule. The final vote is going to be on passage, whether you have to negotiate or not with us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. By firming a deal, we have to get cloture again once we got on the bill. In other words, this is cloture on the motion to proceed to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me explain it to my good friend from West Virginia. Mr. MANCHIN. I understand.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Here is the way it works, colleagues. We have been fiddling around, as the Senator from Maine pointed out, for 24 hours.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. MANCHIN. I know where you are coming from on this. We have a little difference of opinion about this.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Colleagues, here is an understanding of where we are. We have been fiddling around for 2 days on the motion to proceed.

Mr. MANCHIN. If I could make my remarks.

Mr. DURBIN. Who has the floor?

Mr. MCCONNELL. My friend, if that were invoked, there are still 30 more hours postcloture on the motion to proceed.

Once you get on the bill, you have to go through it again. There is no way in which—

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. We should be able to get a bill that we can move forward on with unanimous consent. We really should. That is what I am hoping for. I think we can do it.

Let me go back to where I am coming from. My whole thing is based on the

healthcare right now. You can't throw enough money to fix this if you can't fix the healthcare. If you can't give my people in West Virginia and across this country the feeling that we have a treatment and we are moving forward on a vaccine, they are not leaving their homes. My restaurants aren't going to open up.

The most important thing is, How do we take care of the workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own because businesses have closed? It is the same in my State as in your State—through no fault of their own. That is the package we have to get out. We have \$160 billion moving right now—moving right now.

I am saying this: It looks like things are weighted toward the Wall Street corporations' side. True or false?

We are not in the frontlines. We are not one of the big four.

Many of us—100 of us—are not there negotiating at the table. Our staffs are all having input, and we are working on that. But sitting there and making the final decisions comes down to this: Can we give the confidence that we can rise to the occasion to keep the people healthy in our States? My hospitals need to stay open. My healthcare workers need to be healthy. They need to be protected.

It seems like we are talking about everything else about the economy versus the healthcare. That doesn't make any sense to me whatsoever.

For the people who aren't getting a check right now, we can get a check to them. We should.

It seems like we are more focused on the big corporations and the healthcare of Wall Street than we are on the healthcare of the people in rural America and Main Street. That is the problem I have had on this. That is the problem we have been talking about.

We want to fix this. I am not talking about all the regulations you are talking about. I don't know anything about that. I will find out if it is buried in the bill and it is not what I would approve right now if we don't need it. But if you are giving all of the preferences to the large corporations, they can shill and hide and do buybacks and everything else. Don't you think the American worker ought to get something or be protected in some way? That is what it is like.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as the majority leader said, all this vote is about is, Shall we get on the bill? Can we debate the issue? Can we get together to decide what to do about what is the most significant healthcare crisis in a century in this State? Can we get on the bill? We are saying yes; they are saying no.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia says: What about the people who need help? I have a friend who emailed me last night and said: It is too late; I am closing five small businesses.

These are little businesses.

Well, why did we not vote last night on this, because in this bill is the proposal by Senator COLLINS—Senator COLLINS, Republican; Senator CARDIN, Democrat; Senator RUBIO, Republican; Senator SHAHEEN, Democrat—that would loan money to small businesses of less than 500 people so they can pay their employees in West Virginia and Tennessee. And then, if they did that, it would be forgiven. In other words, it is a grant. They could keep working. That is for the employees. Every day we wait, they don't get paid.

Pass this bill and the laid-off employees would be available for sick leave, which they weren't when the bill came over from the House. Pass this bill today and the employee who was laid off last week could be available for 2 weeks of sick leave at today's salary.

Pass this bill and most Americans would get \$1,200 per person, \$2,400 a couple, \$500 more for a child. They would get it one day sooner if you passed this bill last night.

These are not controversial proposals. On the Collins-Rubio-Cardin-Shaheen proposal, I happened to be watching Robert Reich, the former Labor Secretary for President Clinton, who is about as far to the left as anybody goes, and someone asked him: What would be the single best thing Congress could do to help workers get their money and be paid?

He said it is exactly what the Collins-Rubio-Cardin-Shaheen proposal would do—loan money to those with 500 or less and let them keep working.

As for this business about big corporations, Darden is a big corporation. It owns lots of restaurants. Gaylord is a big corporation. It owns Opryland. If it has a credit problem and the Federal Reserve Board can make sure that it has enough money to stay in business, all the people who work at the Grand Ole Opry can continue to have jobs. If they don't, they will be out of work. What is wrong with that?

I mean, that is the goal. Whether you work for a big company or a little company, you are still an American citizen—whether you work for FedEx or the local diner.

And as far as solving the problem of the disease—and then I will let others speak—pass this bill and 1 day sooner we would have \$10 billion to accelerate treatments. Treatments are what we need. We could accelerate vaccines. Vaccines are what we eventually need. Pass this bill and we would have \$75 billion for hospitals and \$10 billion for those diagnostic treatments I just mentioned. We would have \$1.7 billion to buy more masks.

All of that could happen 1 day sooner if the other side wasn't trying to attach its political agenda to a crisis bill. This is no time to be running a political campaign.

As the majority leader said, the House—dominated by Democrats—sent us their ideas. We passed it through without a single amendment, even

though we didn't agree with many of their ideas. We worked for days with our counterparts on the Democratic side and proposed a bill with their ideas, such as unemployment compensation, at \$600 per person. That is twice as much as you get in unemployment compensation without this bill in Tennessee.

Finally, I would say this: Pass this bill and 1 day sooner a Tennessee worker, instead of getting \$326, would get nearly \$1,000 if he or she has been laid off. There is no excuse for delaying getting on this bill. It is outrageous that it will happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I think we all know what is happening here.

The leader pointed out in his opening remarks that everything was going really quite well. There were a lot of working groups that were meeting. There was great bipartisan cooperation. Both sides were getting ideas included in a plan. Then, yesterday, the Speaker of the House showed up with an agenda and, all of a sudden, it got taken over at the leadership level.

Now, instead of talking about helping workers, we are talking about the Green New Deal and all kinds of other things, including the demands unions and other special interest groups want to see in this deal.

Yet the throwaway line in this is about bailouts for big corporations. Really? Are we going to do that again? Are we going to do this again? You guys are going to come over here and block votes and use the line that this is a bailout for big corporations?

You heard what Senator ALEXANDER just said. This has money in here for workers. This has money for families. This has money for small businesses. It has lots of money, and \$300 billion is going to go to checks: \$1,200 per person, \$2,400 per couple, and \$500 per child, for everybody. There is up to \$75,000 for a single and \$150,000 for a married couple who is filing jointly. There is \$250 billion in here for unemployment insurance, as the Senator from Tennessee pointed out, in order to plus up and top off those unemployment funds that the States have, and we will add \$600 per person, per week for the next 3 months. That is going to help unemployed people in this country.

The Small Business Loan Program, which was just alluded to and which Senators RUBIO, COLLINS, CARDIN, and SHAHEEN have worked on, is a \$350 billion program that allows small businesses to pay their employees, to keep them employed so they keep their jobs and so those jobs don't go away. Right there, that is \$900 billion that will go to workers.

As Senator ALEXANDER pointed out, there is over \$242 billion in this bill that is going to help out with healthcare, and we all know we have to help our hospitals.

Between the \$75 billion in direct spending in this particular provision

and the \$25 billion or more that is going to be part of the Medicare provisions, that will be \$100 billion for hospitals; \$20 billion for veterans' healthcare; \$11 billion for vaccines, therapeutics, diagnostics, and other preparedness needs; \$4.5 billion for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; \$1.7 billion for the Strategic National Stockpile; \$12 billion for the military; \$10 billion for block grants to States; \$12 billion for K-12 education; \$6 billion for higher education; \$5 billion for the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund; \$10 billion for the airports; and \$20 billion for public transportation emergency relief.

All told, there is \$242 billion—\$186 billion, I might add, which will go to the States. Everybody talks about helping out the States. There is \$186 billion of the \$242 billion in this part of the bill that will go to the States.

So there is \$900 billion and another \$250 billion. You are looking at \$1.2 trillion to \$1.3 trillion, roughly, of this bill that will be going to healthcare workers, hospitals, medical providers, families, employees, and unemployed people. That is where it will go.

Yes, there is \$500 billion in here to keep industries afloat that are failing, and they are failing by the day and shedding jobs by the day. These aren't grants—although, the Democrats did want some grants in here, I might add. These are loans. These have to be paid back. Bailouts usually apply to those who did something dumb on their own, who made bad business decisions. These companies aren't in trouble because of something they did on their own. This is no fault of their own. They are in trouble because they have been shut down, and they all hire millions of employees in this country. So, yes, we probably need to do something to help businesses in this country so they can keep working and keep their employees working.

This was put together with a lot of bipartisan input. The leader appointed task forces, and the Democratic leader assigned people to task forces. I observed those meetings and the discussions that went on. They were bipartisan. I participated in some of those. They were bipartisan, and we came together. All of these things that have been put together in this plan were developed with an idea toward getting help to workers, employees, small businesses, healthcare professionals—the people who are fighting the crisis on the frontline. Yet here we are, dillydallying around, and we can't even get on the bill.

As the leader pointed out, there is another 60-vote threshold that comes later. If you want to block it then, you can block it then. We can't even get on the bill. The country is burning. The country is burning, and your side wants to play political games.

It is time to get this done. The American people expect us to act. They need action. We need to work together to get this done for the American people.

Do not come out here and say over and over and over again that this is a bailout for big corporations. This bill is about workers. It is about people. It is about families. It is about people who are hurting out there economically, and we need to do something about it. We are in a position to do something about it, and it is high time that we did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to suggest to my friends on both sides of the aisle that we first assume the appropriate distance and then, secondly, that we take a deep breath. The emotions we have seen on the floor on both sides of the aisle are reflected in homes across America, where families are very emotional at this moment as we face this public health crisis. It is no surprise that it is reflected on the floor of the Senate. We are going to solve this problem, and we are going to do it in a timely way, which the American people expect of us.

We have had two measures now that have come before us—one for \$8 billion and another for \$100 billion—that were addressed on a bipartisan basis with an agreement. This will be as well.

Now, as for this argument that we can't spare 1 minute, that we can't spare 1 day, I understand the sense of urgency.

The House of Representatives passed the second bill, the \$100 billion bill, in the early morning hours of Saturday. When did the Senate pass the bill? It passed it on Wednesday—more than 4 days later.

With regard to this \$100 billion bill, which included medical leave, accelerated access to unemployment compensation, food, new Medicaid payments to States, a guarantee that you would never have to pay for a test, the Republican leader waited 4 days to call that bill. His argument was, Wait a minute; the paperwork is not here. Well, I checked on that because the Senator from Idaho raised it on the floor, and it turns out that, as we have many, many times—and we were prepared here—by consent, you can move on a measure before the paper actually comes across from the other body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for an inquiry?

Mr. DURBIN. I will yield.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, isn't it a fact, when the Senator was up here talking and demanding that we pass that bill, that the bill wasn't here? I have spent 40 years in the Senate, and I have never been able to convince a Parliamentarian that we should vote on a House bill that wasn't here. It wasn't here. The Republicans aren't in charge of the House; it is the Democrats. NANCY PELOSI is in charge of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader has the floor.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I might say to my friend from Idaho that it is not unusual for us to move on a measure before the bill, the paper, has come across the rotunda. We do it by consent. Yes, it happens here, and we were prepared to do it again.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader has the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if time remains on the Republicans' side, they can use it as they wish.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will not yield at this moment. I want to finish my comment as I allowed the Senator from South Dakota to finish his. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will show me that respect. Thank you.

Measures that have been raised this morning are important measures, and for the most part, my colleagues are pushing an open door.

The Rubio-Cardin plan is one that I support. It is supported on a bipartisan basis. I think it is an excellent idea for dealing with the challenges of restaurants and small businesses. I support it. There is no issue in terms of whether that will be included in the final package. I believe it will, and I certainly hope it will.

As for the notion of cash payments that was brought to us by the White House, I don't hear any objection whatsoever on the Democratic side of the aisle to it.

With regard to the notion of extending unemployment insurance and providing additional benefits within unemployment insurance, I guess we are going to argue as to who came up with the idea first, but both sides agree on that basic idea.

So these proposals that have been brought before us are not in controversy, as I understand it, in the negotiations that are underway. The thing that I was concerned about and that Senator SCHUMER addressed—and Senator MANCHIN raised the same issue—was really focusing on the threshold issue of the capacity of our healthcare system to deal with this public health crisis.

When we heard the Governor of New York this morning suggest that the hospitals of that State will have to increase their capacity by 50 percent and that it will still not be enough, it is a suggestion to all of us that we need to start with healthcare and hospitals. It was our feeling that the bill Senator MCCONNELL tried to move yesterday was not adequate. It didn't provide the necessary resources for that. When we return to this measure—it has been said by Senator SCHUMER and others that it could be today, and I pray that it will be—I think you will find additional resources for hospitals and healthcare. In my State, that is a critical element.

Let me also talk about the fact that we are dealing with a bill of great importance and great magnitude. Reflect

for a moment that the amount of money we are talking about in this bill is roughly equivalent to the entire Federal Government's domestic discretionary budget in 1 year. We are dealing with this bill, as we should, on an urgent basis. We should take care to make sure we do the best we can but to not wait for the perfect. Let's make sure we have something that is good and responsive to the needs we have.

I also think that the measure yesterday that was pushed by Senator MCCONNELL did not provide adequate resources to State and local governments. When I talk to my Governor in Illinois, Governor Pritzker, they are spending money in ways they never dreamed of in order to deal with this public health crisis. They are also seeing more unemployment insurance benefits being claimed than we ever have in our history. We need to help the State and local governments, and that was one of the objections we had to the bill yesterday. We didn't feel that it was adequate.

When it comes to corporations and providing help to businesses, large and small, count me in. I am one of those Democrats who stood for the stimulus package that President Obama brought before us because I thought it was necessary. I still believe we did the right thing in passing that stimulus package when many on the other side of the aisle did not. Part of that package helped larger corporations, and so be it, for I thought that was necessary. Yet we learned a bitter lesson. Many times, the benefits being given to those corporations and the tax breaks being given to them translated into stock buybacks, whereby they took the money and ran. We don't want that to happen again.

Arguing for transparency and accountability on the money that goes to any business, large or small, is not unreasonable, and it used to be bipartisan. We are arguing over that, debating over that, and negotiating over that at this minute.

Let me also say that I continue to be amazed at the references to the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI. She really unnerves a lot of people on that side of the aisle. She is the Speaker of the House, you know, and the measure—whatever we do here—will be headed over there for consideration. The fact that she would want to be party to that negotiation is not an outrageous idea. It happens to be consistent with the bicameral system of government that we have.

The Senator from Kentucky got up and talked about how she came into the meeting and ruined the whole meeting by asserting herself as the Speaker of the House. It is reasonable for her to do that. In fact, the suggestion by Senator SCHUMER at the outset was that we have the four corners—the four leaders, the Democrats and Republicans—and a representative of the White House for this negotiation. That approach was rejected by the Senator

from Kentucky. We will do our own, he says. We will get back to you when we have a Republican plan. It was not bipartisan from the start, and it should be all the way. It is the only way it will work.

Let me say for a moment that if and when we have reached an agreement—and I pray that it will be done under the circumstances—and if and when we vote for cloture on the motion to proceed, at that point, the Senator from Kentucky can offer any amendment he wishes. At that point, I hope that we will have an agreement and that we will all agree to do it in a quick fashion. Yet this idea that it is going to be instantaneous as soon as we vote for the motion on cloture on the motion to proceed is not a fact, and it hasn't been for a long time.

Let me just conclude by making an observation on something related to our meeting here today and what is going on in the United States of America. Five of our Members did not vote yesterday on the Republican side of the aisle. One has been diagnosed as having COVID-19, and the other four are self-quarantining because of the concern about their own health, which is natural. It is naive for us to believe this will be the end of this challenge to our membership.

I implore Senators to consider the bipartisan measure that Senator PORTMAN and I have offered for remote voting. We should not be physically present on this floor at this moment. We know better, and our staff is subjected to whatever we bring on the floor in terms of viral load. Let's think about this in human terms. Too many of our colleagues and their families are falling prey to this disease. We should change the rules of the Senate to reflect humanity and reality. It is the 21st century. Voting in a remote fashion, as I have suggested with Senator PORTMAN, is the best way, I think, to protect us and our families from further problems from a health viewpoint.

Let me close by saying a final word on this. Senator SCHUMER came to the floor and didn't say, with arms crossed, we are stonewalling. He said he had to leave the floor to go back and negotiate. With whom? He left the floor to negotiate with the Republican leaders from the White House and, perhaps, from other places. That is the way it should be.

We are going to get this done today. Take a deep breath. Everybody is emotional at this moment on both sides of the aisle, but we have a job to do, and we are going to get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). For the information of the Members, the majority has approximately 14 minutes, and the minority has 15 minutes.

Which Member seeks recognition?

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I have been here for 5 years. I came from another world, one in which, to get any-

thing done, you had to compromise. The problem we have today is that I can't find any partners with whom to compromise.

This bill has been characterized as another bailout for large corporations. Really? That is the most amazing characterization I could hear today.

When I look at this, what this bill is focused on is the American worker, who, in the time we have been debating this morning here, thousands have had phone calls given to them today by their employer to say: We are sorry, but because of the liquidity situation we have, there is no demand for our products or services. We need you to go home.

That has been going on now for weeks, while we sit up here and talk and blame each other for things.

The time for action is right now. This bill gives us an opportunity to bring over almost \$2 trillion of liquidity to the American people who are in need. This is not about Big Business. As a matter of fact, I don't see any grants in here. What I see are liquidity opportunities so employers can keep their relationship with the employees.

We have already heard the details today: direct payments of \$300 billion directly to individuals, \$250 billion for 3 months of unemployment insurance—unprecedented—\$350 billion going directly to small businesses. Why? So that they can keep their employees employed, even if they are furloughed.

There are \$500 billion being made available for loans through our banking community. This is federally guaranteed loans. These are not grants. These are not moneys that are going to go to the boards and the executives and all that. This is money that is going for the purpose of getting directly to payroll.

There are \$517 billion of tax deferrals on withholding taxes on the corporate side. That is a 1-year deferral. That is not a guarantee; it is not a grant.

There are \$250 billion of other moneys, 180 of which is going to cities and municipalities and States.

And I agree with the assistant leader of the Democratic Party that we might need to do more for our States, and let's get to it, if that is the biggest issue here, but that is not the biggest issue. There are so many of these other things that are being thrown in this bill because it is a big bill; it is unprecedented.

But let me just say this: What we have done is try to make this a situation where we can avoid a liquidity crisis causing an insolvency crisis, and that is the most damaging thing we can do to the American worker.

At the end of the day, the American worker has something that they all have in common. They have an employer. That employer is made up of investors, just like you and I, who invest in those companies who employ these people.

This is not a government employing 150 million people in our workforce.

This is about getting the American economy a bridge—and that is all this is, is a bridge to weather this medical crisis that we have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments from the Senator from Georgia. There are plenty of negotiations going on. I don't know what he means when he says he doesn't have anybody to negotiate with. I just spent 2 hours with Secretary Mnuchin talking about provisions of this bill.

We spent hours on Friday and Saturday talking within our committees. I applaud Senator RUBIO, what he and Senator CARDIN did. There has been bipartisanship but not from the majority leader, and that has really fundamentally been the problem—the Republican leader.

Let's back up. Let's back up 10 days. I stood on this floor—Senator DURBIN was here, a bunch of us—when Senator MCCONNELL on a Thursday night, we were this close to agreement with the House on the second package, the one that had sick leave policy. We were that close.

Senator MCCONNELL decided he had to go back to Kentucky to go to a political event with a Justice of the Supreme Court—a political event with a Justice of the Supreme Court.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. Of course.

Mr. COTTON. When did the Senate receive that bill from the House?

Mr. BROWN. That is not the point. The point is that—

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. COTTON. Will you answer my question? When did we receive that bill?

Mr. BROWN. I don't know the day, but I know it was a day or two later.

Mr. COTTON. Where has the House been for the last week?

Mr. BROWN. I am not yielding now, Senator COTTON. I know you always want to do Trump's—the President's bidding. I have the floor, and I will keep the floor.

The fact is, we were in negotiations with Speaker PELOSI, I assume with Leader MCCARTHY. In the Senate, we were this close to legislation.

Senator MCCONNELL went home. Senator COTTON is not disputing the fact he went home for a political event with a Justice of the Supreme Court, for gosh sakes—went home.

We didn't vote Friday. We didn't vote Saturday. We didn't vote Sunday. We didn't vote Monday. We didn't vote Tuesday. We didn't vote until Wednesday. So we have tried to be bipartisan.

Senator MCCONNELL then dispatched all of us just a few days ago to do negotiations within our committees. I sat with—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. Well, I would like to sort of explain the details, but if the

time comes out of your time, I would be glad to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. My question will be short.

Is it not true that the bill to which the Senator refers was still being written over the weekend, and it would have been impossible for the U.S. Senate to vote on it before Monday?

Mr. BROWN. No. The answer to that question is no. It would have been possible. We can always suspend the rules and move if it is in the national interest.

But we didn't vote—you know this, Senator ALEXANDER—we didn't vote until Wednesday.

But let me back up. This weekend Senator CRAPO and I and Banking Committee Members were making progress on Friday and Saturday. Then Saturday night, Senator MCCONNELL decided that he would take everything back and write a partisan bill. So don't tell us that this has been a bipartisan effort.

Again, Senator RUBIO and Senator CARDIN had some bipartisan efforts. We attempted that, but the fact is, we need to learn from 10 years ago. The same people came to us and said: We need this bailout. They promised that it would help people stay in their homes. They promised it would be money in the pockets of workers.

The banks have done well, the executives have done well, but since then, wages have basically remained flat. The American people don't want another corporate bailout. They don't want a bailout for Wall Street. They don't want a bailout for the airlines. They want money—if we are going to do a relief package, the money needs to go in the pockets of workers.

We know that hundreds of people, thousands of people in each of our States are faced every day with this situation: Do I go to work? I am sick today. Do I go to work and possibly infect somebody else in the workplace or do I stay home and lose the pay I need in order to pay my mortgage or in order to pay my rent?

This plan is all about a corporate bailout. The money—\$425 billion that the Secretary of Treasury can decide is a slush fund or where to direct that money instead of money going to workers, to food banks, to unemployment insurance, to sick days policy, to all of the things that we need to do to keep businesses going and people in their homes.

We have a prohibition that so far Senator MCCONNELL has objected to on foreclosures and evictions. You all know the statistics—40 percent of Americans don't have \$400 discretionary money in their pockets that they can use in an emergency to fix their car or whatever.

If they go several weeks without pay, they will be evicted; they will be foreclosed on. We need Senator MCCONNELL to actually agree to that.

And when it comes to the \$425 billion slush fund, we want to help these busi-

nesses, especially small businesses. We want to help the airlines, but we need to make sure that this money passes through to employees. That means no corporate bailouts without investing in the dignity of work; it means if you are taking taxpayer money, no stock buybacks, no sending jobs overseas, no outsourcing your jobs to independent contractors, no golden parachutes for executives, no using taxpayer dollars to bust unions, no wage cuts for these employees, no healthcare or pension cuts.

If we put money into these businesses, this money is there not for the executives; it is there for the workers, and it is there for the community. It means actually helping people stay in their homes.

If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. We have to show the people we serve that we have learned from Congress's mistake 10 years ago when the banks did very well, thank you. And Wall Street again will do very well, thank you, under the McConnell plan.

We have to come together to put money in people's pockets. We need to help people stay in their homes. We need to invest in healthcare workers who are on the frontlines. We need to mobilize American manufacturers.

The partisan McConnell plan doesn't do this. The bipartisan work we are trying to do could do this. We know we can get through this together, put this partisanship aside, and come together for the people whom we serve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I would defer to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the discussion we just heard was about when the Senate could have voted on H.R. 6201, which was the bill that came over from the House.

When did that bill from the House of Representatives arrive in the U.S. Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It came to the Senate on Tuesday, the 17th.

Mr. ALEXANDER. On Tuesday, the 17th.

And my second question is, Could the U.S. Senate have voted on that bill before it arrived from the House of Representatives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would take consent. The Senate has done it on several occasions. In one case, H.R. 3630, the Middle Class Tax Relief & Job Creation Act; another case, H.R. 2194, Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Investment Act. It would take consent.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Did anyone ask consent that it be voted on before Wednesday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not have any record of a request for consent.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I want to talk about the bill that we want to vote on right now and why it is so important that we pass it.

For my part, what I work on is support for our farmers and our ranchers, and that is exactly what we have put in this bill is help and support for our farmers and ranchers, for rural America.

And yet, my understanding is that Democrats are objecting to the help and support that we have put in this bill for our farmers and ranchers.

Last week, the Department of Homeland Security recognized that agriculture—our supply of food, fiber, and feed—is one of our Nation's critical industries. Our country has been blessed with an abundant, affordable, and safe food supply that we rarely stop to notice but that we depend on every single day and we certainly depend on at this time with this pandemic.

The good news is, our farmers and ranchers, our ag sector, are out there working every day, carrying on this critical work of ensuring that we have the food on our grocery shelves throughout this pandemic.

The bad news is, the farm economy, already facing a number of years of declining income, has taken a further nosedive on account of the coronavirus. So we have put forward assistance to make sure we address that.

Let me just give you one example, though, of the difficulty faced in farm country, in rural America.

The cattle industry has lost between \$7 billion and \$9 billion over the last 2 months—over the last 2 months—and that is just one sector of our ag economy.

Congress needs to act, and we need to act now, to ensure that farmers, ranchers, and rural America—farmers, ranchers, and rural America—receive the relief they desperately need.

Why would Democrats object to that? Why would they object to that?

We included two important provisions to ensure that rural America and our farm and ranch families receive assistance.

First, we replenish the Commodity Credit Corporation, making sure that the CCC has the funding necessary to carry out the farm bill, including the farm safety net, conservation programs, trade programs, as well as emergency and ad hoc programs like the Market Facilitation Program.

Second, we increase CCC authority to ensure that we can meet the coronavirus impact on agriculture head-on. That makes sense. That is in the bill. They are objecting to it. They are objecting. This is our food supply. This is our food chain.

We also included an important provision that enables USDA to provide critical support to ranchers during this market downturn—to ranchers. However, the Senate Democrats are objecting to that provision. Congressional Democratic leadership has objected to helping our farmers and ranchers in this relief package.

The bill also includes an additional \$15.5 billion for the SNAP program—for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, for food stamps—to provide nutrition assistance for those affected by this economic downturn.

I urge my colleagues to get on board and support our farmers, our ranchers, and our food supply. Support rural America. Quit objecting to rural America. Quit objecting to our farmers and ranchers. We can't let that happen. We have talked about the importance of the bill. It is important for our entire country, and it is certainly important for our farmers and for our ranchers and for the food supply—the lowest cost, highest quality food supply that they provide every single American every single day.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President.

Mr. TILLIS. The majority has 5 minutes. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Do you know what the American people are thinking right now? They are thinking that the brain is an amazing organ. It starts working in a mother's womb, and it doesn't stop working until you get elected to Congress.

Do you know what the American people are thinking right now? They are thinking that this country was founded by geniuses, but it is being run by a bunch of idiots.

Do you know what the American people are thinking right now? They are thinking, Why do the Members of the U.S. Senate continue to double down on stupid? This is not a Republican bill, Mr. Chairman; this is a bipartisan bill. We have spent hours and hours and hours negotiating these provisions with our Democratic friends.

This is not a slush fund. This bill to help people and businesses in America. This bill is going to increase unemployment insurance. This bill is going to send \$1,200 to every man and woman in America—taxpayers who make less than \$75,000 a year—and \$500 for each of their children.

This bill is going to help every small business in this country. It is not a bailout. It provides up to \$350 billion for small businesses for the next 8 weeks to keep them going, and if they don't lay anybody off, the bill provides that the loans are forgiven.

We have some businesses in this country that are bigger than 500 employees. This bill has a provision to help them, too, as well. In the America I was raised in, growing your business and becoming as large as possible was something we aspired to.

This bill does not create a slush fund for the Treasury Secretary. It provides

\$75 billion to help some of our industries hardest hit in a collateralized loan, not a bailout, and then provides another \$425 billion to the Federal Reserve under section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act, which the Federal Reserve will make available to all businesses, including those that don't qualify as a small business. It is not a gift. We can negotiate warrants; we can negotiate stock options; we can take a piece of their company in stock.

I don't understand it. I get politics; I have been around it my whole life. But there comes a time when we have to stop thinking about the next election and start thinking about the next generation.

What are we going to leave to our children if we allow this economy to crash? And it is happening as we speak. I mean no ill will toward my Democratic friends. I like and respect every one of them. But let's pass this bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection by the Senator from Connecticut is heard.

There is less than 10 minutes remaining.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, you can't keep on saying it is a bipartisan bill when it clearly is not. If it were a bipartisan bill, you wouldn't have this level of angst from the Democrats who were shut out of the process.

Let's be clear about what we are talking about here. We don't think your bill works. We don't think the bill that has been drafted by the majority party is going to fix the problem. This is a policy disagreement, and I have an obligation as a representative of my State to stand up and say when I don't think a \$2 trillion bill is going to fix the problem. It may make a lot of people rich, but it doesn't have the resources in it today to take care of the most vulnerable in this country, and it is not going to do the primary job at hand, which is to stop the virus.

Remember, there is no amount of economic stimulus we can pass—\$1 trillion, \$2 trillion, \$3 trillion—that will solve this problem if we don't get serious about the public health crisis that exists today. When you shortchange States, when you don't provide enough money to help my State and my municipalities manage testing, move congregate populations apart from each other, and try to manage the crisis, then you aren't serious about stopping the virus. Yes, one of the outstanding issues in this bill is that we think we need more funding for the States and municipalities that are on the frontlines of fighting the virus. Yes, we don't think this bill will work—will work—at job No. 1, which is stopping the public health crisis, unless we provide ample funding. And, yes, we are worried about the lack of conditionality on funding to big businesses, to

Wall Street. Yes, we are worried about the fact that this is going to make rich people much richer and, at the same time, not actually stop the public health crisis.

These are policy differences. Instead of coming down here and having showboat after showboat, we should be sitting together trying to resolve differences that, frankly, I don't think are so large that they can't be solved within the next several hours.

I just hope we understand that we are down here very frustrated because we worry that we are about to vote on a bill that is not going to solve the problem. That is a policy disagreement but a policy disagreement that can be resolved.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 5½ minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, during the past couple of weeks, I have been talking to Montanans about their needs as we deal with this coronavirus. Healthcare officials tell me that folks on the frontlines need more masks, more protective equipment, and, quite frankly, this bill does not get that done. It helps, but it doesn't get it done. Small businesses and their employees are telling me that they need immediate access to relief. This bill doesn't do that because, quite frankly, we need more on the front end on bridge loans. Tax credits are great, but you have to be in business to be able to take advantage of those. Mayors and local city officials are worried that if they can't keep up with the mounting needs their communities are facing, this bill fails them. Tribal leaders across Montana have made it clear to me and to other folks in this body that they are largely and unfortunately ignored in the bill before us.

This bill is nearly \$2 trillion. One of the things it does do, and I know there are folks on the floor right now who disagree, but the fact is, massive corporations through that \$500 billion slush fund, which, I might add, has very little, if any, transparency or accountability—it goes to those folks.

Look, I think all of us agree that \$2 trillion is a lot of money. It is all borrowed money, and if there is ever a time to borrow money, it is in economic times like these, but this needs to be a targeted, temporary support to keep our economy going.

As the Senator from Connecticut said, the fact is that this bill, particularly this slush fund, is not a good use of taxpayer money. It would allow an unelected official with no accountability to the American people to dole out \$500 billion while hiding the receipts for months, if not longer.

I know there are Senators who say: Well, they can get warrants for these loans. They must get warrants for these loans.

These companies can take advantage of hundreds of billions of dollars of this money and continue to lay off some of those same taxpayers who are supporting them through their taxes.

Montanans know we can do better, and they expect better. Working together, I am going to tell you, we can get this done. There isn't a person in this body who hasn't filled a leadership position outside of their service to the U.S. Senate. You know that you need to negotiate and you need to compromise. If that is done and it is done in good faith, we will have a bill before the day is done.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I can give you a very long list to describe everything we are doing here to help small business people in this country, our hospitals, personal protective equipment.

Let me say this. This bill was written by both Democrats and Republicans in good faith. It is time to get over our differences and put our country before ourselves. Let's come together and vote this bill out of the Senate now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes 40 seconds.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me just say, strike a responsible distance and take a deep breath. We are going to pass this bill—not the one that Senator MCCONNELL brought before us yesterday but a version of that, which I think is a dramatic improvement.

My prayer is that bill is going to include even more money than the McConnell bill when it comes to dealing with the healthcare crisis we face and the challenge we face—more money for hospitals, more money for providers, and more money for equipment, and we are going to have to come back again, I am sorry to say, if this continues, to make sure we put even greater investment in the men and women who will save our lives across this country.

Secondly, we want to make certain that this McConnell bill is improved when it comes to accountability for the taxpayer dollars given to the largest corporations in America. Some of us feel burned by what has happened with some of those corporations in the past when we trusted their leadership to build their companies and help their employees, but, instead, they built up their own bank accounts at the expense of their employees. We don't want to return to those days. I am sure the Republicans don't either. We want language in this bill that moves this in the direction of accountability and transparency when it comes to spending taxpayers' dollars by major corporations.

Third, never overlook the need of State and local governments. They

have been waiting, begging, and pleading with the administration in the White House to give national leadership. Absent that, they have taken on the responsibility themselves. They are asking us to stand behind them as they make these difficult decisions, State by State by State, because the White House refuses to make these same decisions. We need to provide the resources to do that. State and local governments need that help, and I believe the McConnell bill could be improved by providing more resources in that regard.

There are so many bipartisan things that we do agree upon in this bill. Let's get these things right. As Senator MURPHY of Connecticut said, if we don't get it right in terms of dealing with the coronavirus, we can't put enough money on the table for economic recovery. Let's do it.

I am sorry we are going to this roll call. It is not an indication of the progress that I believe has been made since yesterday in negotiating a bipartisan approach to improving the McConnell bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. I think it is time to recognize that.

Thank you.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 157, H.R. 748, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Mike Rounds, Mitt Romney, James E. Risch, Lamar Alexander, Steve Daines, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott, Martha McSally, Deb Fischer, Marco Rubio, John Boozman, James Lankford, Rob Portman, Tom Cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 748, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage, shall be brought to a close upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the order.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—5

Gardner	Paul	Scott of Florida
Lee	Romney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 46.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative upon reconsideration, the motion is rejected.

MIDDLE CLASS HEALTH BENEFITS TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2019—Motion to Proceed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 748, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 157, H.R. 748, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues on both sides, as a result of this procedural obstruction, let me explain where we are.

By refusal to allow us to take this first step, which would have still given them plenty of time to negotiate, we have put the Senate in the following position: If any 1 of the 100 of us chooses to object, we can't deal with this until Friday or Saturday at the earliest. If any 1 of the 100 of us objects to some of the procedural hurdles we have to overcome as a result of this mindless obstruction—absolutely mindless obstruction going on on the other side, while the public is waiting for us to

act, while people are losing their jobs, losing their income, and shutting down the economy, which we have had to do to deal with this public health crisis, they are fiddling around with Senate procedure that could, if 1 Senator objected, take us all the way to the end of the week to solve this problem.

I am beginning to think our Democratic colleagues don't understand the procedure in the Senate. I am not sure you understand the position your leader has put you in. He loses nothing—nothing—in terms of negotiating leverage by letting us get through these procedural hoops sooner rather than later—sooner rather than later.

The American people have had enough of this nonsense. They wonder where we are. They are looking to us to solve this problem.

The Secretary of the Treasury keeps going into the Democratic leader's office, and the list keeps getting longer and longer and longer. The bazaar is apparently open on the other side. Never let a crisis go to waste, one former President's Chief of Staff famously said.

So, look, I hope my colleagues will come out here and express themselves in the course of the afternoon. The American people would like to hear from us. They would like to know what is going on here. So let's tell them.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SASSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we are at an odd spot right now not just as a Senate but as a nation. We have millions of people who are gathered in their own homes, trying to figure out what is going to happen next, waiting for a virus to die down. We have people in a hospital who are afraid because there is no tested treatment yet. We have firefighters; we have law enforcement; we have hospital workers all with not enough personal protection equipment because they do not know who is a citizen without the virus and who is a citizen with the virus.

The most basic elements of decision making of how you take care of your neighbor have become a distraction across the country as Americans have become afraid of a stranger and of a friend. This is a huge shift in where we are as a country. What this demands is immediate action. Three weeks ago, the Senate and the House passed \$8.3 billion, and we did it with an overwhelming bipartisan support, to add additional funding for diagnostics, for testing, and for rapid work on a vaccine. All of that work is advancing quickly. We have human trials on a vaccine happening right now because

we came together, and there weren't extra things added to it. We focused in on the problem, which is the virus.

This body has a lot of things we disagree on, there is no question. There are lots of moments to debate the things we disagree on, but this is a time we need to focus in on what is the problem, and the problem is dealing with COVID-19. There was a bipartisan bill that was put together in the Senate.

A week ago today, Senator SCHUMER released a 10-page list of—here are the things the Democrats would like from the Senate. It was a 10-page, very detailed list. Twenty-eight of those items on that list are included in this bipartisan bill—28 items from it, of that 10-page list of items. So much of that list that was released a week ago is included in this bipartisan bill.

Republican chairmen and Democratic ranking members of the committees of jurisdiction met and talked about this. The chairman and the ranking member of Appropriations worked together on an appropriations package for a quarter of a trillion dollars on just that one section that they worked on together to get resolution. Put all of those items together, and let me tell you what I mean by that: \$250 billion dealing with things as distant to believe as things like getting Peace Corps volunteers back home, away from where they are now. We have to get them back home and away from harm's way. There is funding in there for that as well as \$88 billion for hospitals, trying to help them through this; help for nursing homes; help for individual firefighters and their departments; \$10 billion for community development block grants to help cities as they are rapidly trying to work through this process—\$250 billion allocated just to things like that to help people get testing, personal equipment, travel and additional expenses, teleworking capabilities that have to be done for cities and communities and Federal entities. All of those things were put together and agreed upon.

There is a lot of work on the medical side, rightfully so. Testing makes a world of difference on this. Getting access to a vaccine—there are billions of dollars in that particular area. All of that is included in this proposal.

In addition to that, there are direct payments that we had agreed upon to send out, literally, to every American. We had set up \$1,200 for every American to receive. That is a stopgap method to help folks who are having trouble with their utilities or whatever it may be, or extra expenses so they will have something.

It was not just that for the individuals. It was also unemployment insurance. This is something the Republicans and Democrats had worked on together, to do a plus-up of unemployment insurance because we have millions of people suddenly unemployed with no advanced warning at all.

There is a significant increase of unemployment insurance that is built