

that is not what we are talking about here.

No. 8, we need to provide a reasonable Federal unemployment insurance supplement to help struggling families during this difficult time when so many people have lost jobs through no fault of their own, but we need to make sure that we are not creating a disincentive to return to work when jobs reopen. That is why I like the approach of either having an 80-percent replacement of the pre-job-loss wage or figuring out a formula that would approach 80 percent. That is far higher than the normal wage replacement under our State systems, but these are extraordinary times.

No. 9, we need an emergency appropriation for the U.S. Postal Service. Otherwise, I am worried that the Postal Service will not be able to meet its payroll starting the second quarter of next year. Think of the costs the Postal Service has incurred. It has had to retrofit every post office, every processing center in this country, as well as provide protective gear to its postal employees who are both essential and frontline workers.

Those are the elements that I believe should be in the next coronavirus package. While there are disagreements on perhaps three of the nine elements that I have suggested, by and large, there is agreement on seven of the elements. There may be disputes about exactly how much money should be appropriated, but we can work those disputes out, just as we do in the appropriations process.

We simply cannot wait and do nothing and just hope for the best. Hope is not an effective strategy when it comes to dealing with this persistent pandemic. The American people have demonstrated resilience, courage, and compassion during this crisis, but they need our additional help.

I hope that next week we will put aside the partisan bickering, the “just say no” approach that we have seen, unfortunately, from the Democratic leader, and that we will come together for the good of the American people; that we will come together not as Democrats and Republicans and Independents but as Americans to do what our country needs done right now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant senior legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

REMEMBERING JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise today to remember a daughter of New York and an American giant. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was an icon, a legend, and a role model for so many people, myself included. We may never

see a jurist with her kind of courage again in our lifetimes.

The daughter of an immigrant furrier and Garment District bookkeeper, born and raised in Brooklyn, she pushed back against every expectation and limitation that society had for her and rose to the bench of the highest Court in the land. She was a brilliant legal mind, an unparalleled jurist, an opera fan, fearless dissenter, and the “Notorious RBG.”

Justice Ginsburg spent her whole life fighting against injustices, those she faced personally and those she could not abide in society.

When Ruth Bader Ginsburg went to law school, she was one of just 9 women in her class of 500. She graduated at the top of her class but was rejected by law firm after law firm because she was a woman and because she was a mother. Undaunted, she found a different path to success.

She educated generations of law students at Rutgers and Columbia and spent her time outside the classroom at the ACLU, becoming an architect of the plan to eradicate gender discrimination. One strategically chosen case at a time, she proved to a male-dominated legal system that discrimination on the basis of sex is real. She was a trailblazer. She took herself to places that few women had ever been, and she took the law to places it had never been.

She stood for all of us. She stood against discrimination in all its forms. She was someone who fundamentally understood the gifts that people have to give to this country regardless of one's sex, one's gender orientation, one's race, or one's background.

She knew that the words etched in stone above the entrance of the Supreme Court—“Equal Justice Under Law”—were still a goal, not a given, and she fought to make them a reality every day of her life.

As has been noted, in the Jewish tradition, only those of great righteousness die on Rosh Hashanah—because God determined that they were needed until the end. Justice Ginsburg was truly someone of great righteousness, and at the very end, she left us with one final message: “My most fervent wish is that I not be replaced until a new president is installed.”

She asked us to respect the right of the American people to be heard, but within just hours of her passing, that wish was denied by Members of this body.

The hypocrisy of my colleagues is breathtaking. The same Members rushing this process are the very same ones who denied Merrick Garland hearings because his nomination was supposedly too close to an election. He was nominated in March. It is nearly October. This election is not just close. It is already happening. People across the country are already casting their ballots. Yet this is about more than rank hypocrisy. Let's look at what is really at stake.

The first case that will be argued in November will decide if 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions will continue to have access to affordable healthcare. Think about that. My Republican colleagues are rushing through the confirmation of a judge in order to nearly guarantee that 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions will see their premiums go up or have their healthcare ripped away entirely. That would be inhumane at any time, but in the middle of a pandemic, it is truly unthinkable.

They are rushing to vote on a Justice who will decide the fate of more than 640,000 DACA recipients who have known no other home, no other country, but this one.

They seek to confirm a judge who will revoke the rights of 50 percent of the population to make decisions about their own bodies and their reproductive healthcare.

This new judge could very well overturn recently decided cases that have finally granted same-sex couples the fundamental right to marry the persons whom they love.

This new judge will likely decide on the Nation's ability to conduct a fair and accurate census and the right of every person in this country to have equal representation under the law.

It is clear to me why our colleagues are rushing this. They fear that the American people simply don't agree with their views. They fear that this is their last chance to impose an ultra-conservative view on our country, in which women's rights, LGBTQ rights, and immigrants' rights take a back seat to corporate interests and discrimination. That is not what the American people want. They should get the chance to have their say. Their ability to access healthcare, to marry, to live in this country, and to be represented fairly and fully by this government is on the line. Their rights hang in the balance.

The actions of my colleagues deny the people a voice. What does that say about this Chamber? What does it say about our democracy?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENDING THE UNDERTAKING SPAM, SPYWARE, AND FRAUD ENFORCEMENT WITH ENFORCERS BEYOND BORDERS ACT OF 2006

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4779 and that

the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4779) to extend the Undertaking Spam, Spyware, And Fraud Enforcement With Enforcers beyond Borders Act of 2006, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, this bill, H.R. 4779, "To extend the Undertaking Spam, Spyware, And Fraud Enforcement With Enforcers beyond Borders Act of 2006," would reauthorize the U.S. SAFE WEB Act, which is an important tool for the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and take action against the scams, robocalls, and fraud that may span international borders. It would save consumers the hardship and heartbreak, financial pain, and emotional travail of fraud, scams, and robocalls that may have international implications and impacts.

The SAFE WEB Act has been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis over many years. I am pleased to cooperate and collaborate with Senator MORAN of Kansas, who is a great partner in consumer protection and this effort and is the chairman of the subcommittee on which I am the ranking member.

We all know that fraud spawned by foreign criminal organizations, as well as domestic ones, has caused significant harm to consumers here. Therefore, this measure will provide the tools that are essential to the FTC in protecting consumers and in enforcing the law.

I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 4779) was passed.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in a few moments we are going to vote on the

motion to proceed to H.R. 8337, the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2021 and Other Extensions Act of 2020.

I will speak a little bit about what is in there, but I will urge all Members to vote aye.

The bill provides funding for the government through December 11 at fiscal year 2020 funding levels. It will be under the same terms and conditions contained in the fiscal year 2020 appropriations laws. These were the laws that Chairman SHELBY and I brought to the floor and have been voted on.

It includes several authorization matters to extend programs that otherwise would expire, including some important health and veteran programs.

So as vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I support the bill, but I am disappointed that it is needed at all.

As I have said many times, we had ample—ample time in the Senate to complete our work on the 12 appropriations bills, but we didn't mark up a single one. In June, July, we could have passed all 12 of them, but the majority leader wouldn't even bring up a single one of them.

Apparently, he is more interested in confirming extreme rightwing judges than moving legislation to address the needs of the American people, including appropriations bills or critical legislation to combat the COVID virus and its impact on families and the economy.

I chuckle, too, in a way ruefully because, of course, my friends on the other side—especially if there is a Democratic administration—say they must follow the Thurman rule, named after their revered former President pro tempore from the Republican side, that you cannot have any confirmations after the first of July. But, of course, they have forgotten their own Republican rule when they have a Republican President. We all know the facts on that, but I think what the American people have to understand is that because of the time we spent on that, because of the refusal to even allow 1—even 1—of the 12 appropriations bills to come up for a vote and allow everybody to either vote for it or against it—and with Republicans having a majority, if they didn't like anything in it, they could vote it down. But saying that, no, we want to talk about it, but we are kind of afraid to actually have to vote on it—I don't know why we are afraid to vote. That is what we get elected to do.

I have cast over 16,000 votes in this body. Actually, I was told today that is more than all but 1 of the nearly 2,000 Senators who have served here.

But what we have done is we have conceded we can't do our most basic job of completing appropriations bills on time, and in doing that, we have failed to address an unprecedented health and economic crisis for months.

Last week more than 870,000 Americans filed for unemployment benefits for the first time. It is not 870,000

Americans who have filed in the past; this is 870,000 Americans filing for unemployment benefits for the first time. That is because of this pandemic.

Kitchen cabinets across the country are bare as families struggle without enough to eat. Schools do not have enough resources to teach our children at home or protect them inside the classroom.

This is infuriating. I think Senator SHELBY and I could have gotten those 12 bills. On some parts of them, some would vote for it; some would vote against it. But we were ready to vote back in June and July. In the meantime, we now have 200,000 Americans who have died, and we have yet to vote.

I am afraid that what the President wants to do—and my friends on the Republican side—is cast aside the desperate needs of the American people in favor of government on autopilot.

Apparently, right now, they are more concerned with securing a hyperpartisan Supreme Court than the health and safety of the American people and are doing the most basic job of Congress. It is that simple.

I will have more to say about the continuing resolution in the coming days as we move forward toward final passage. But the last thing our country needs is a government shutdown in the middle of a global pandemic and an unprecedented economic crisis.

I regret that leadership would not allow us to vote on these appropriations bills because I am convinced we would have had enough Republicans and Democrats who would have come together and passed all 12 of them if we had been allowed to vote, even though it means that some would have to cast difficult votes, but that is what we are here for.

For this one, while it is far from perfect, I will urge all Members to vote aye on the motion to proceed.

Mr. President, I see my distinguished colleague on the floor is ready to speak, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3993

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, we are 40 days today from a general election—40 days—40 days until the American people make their choice, or at least that is the idea.

But there are a group of people who seem intent on influencing the people's choice, on manipulating it, on shaping it according to their own preferences. I am not talking about China or Russia or Iran; I am talking about a group of corporations—the most powerful corporations in the history of this Nation, the most powerful corporations in the history of the world. I am talking about being Big Tech.

We know who they are. They run the giant digital platforms, the places where Americans communicate and share their opinions. But those platforms are more than that. They are more than places to talk or buy things. Facebook and Google, Twitter and

Instagram and YouTube—these are the platforms that control more and more of our daily lives.

And, yes, I said “control.” These platforms control our social communication, the way that we talk to each other, when and how, where, and on what terms. They control what news we read or even what news we see.

They control more and more journalism in America, right down to what is in news articles and how the headlines are written.

They control how elected officials communicate with their constituents, when they can run advertisements, what their messages can say and can’t.

And they want to control us. Big Tech platforms relentlessly spy on their customers—you and me. They track us around the web. They monitor our every move online and even when we are offline.

They track our location and whether we are in a car or riding a bike or on the street. They track the websites that we visit and when. They track the things that we buy. They track the videos that we watch. They track what our children are doing. They track everything—all with the purpose of getting enough information on each one of us to influence us, to shape our preferences and opinions and viewpoints.

This is enormous power—unheard of power—and the Big Tech platforms are intent on using it. They are intent on using it in this election.

Let’s just cut to the chase: The Big Tech platforms are owned and operated by woke capitalists. They are leftists. They are liberals. They are not conservatives. They are no friend to conservatives. They fervently opposed the election of Donald Trump and other conservatives in 2016. They fervently oppose it this year.

Now they are trying to use their power to shape the outcome of an election. For months, the tech platforms have been engaging in escalating acts of censorship—political censorship—aimed at conservatives.

They have censored the President of the United States. They have banned pro-life groups from their sites. They have tried to silence independent conservative journalists like the Federalist.

Now, the censorship is never against liberals, notice. No, Joe Biden isn’t censored. Pro-choice groups aren’t discriminated against. Liberal news sites, they don’t get threatened and bullied and shut out.

No, Big Tech targets conservatives for censorship for a simple reason: They don’t like conservatives. They don’t agree with conservatives. They don’t want to see conservatives get elected.

Here is the thing: If they are allowed to use their power in this way, if they are permitted to leverage their control over news and information and data to silence the voices of conservatives, then we will be turning control of our government over to them.

Big Tech targets conservatives for censorship for a simple reason: They don’t like conservatives. They don’t agree with conservatives.

We will be turning control of our elections over to them, control of the Nation over to them. Let’s just be clear. No corporation should run America. No set of corporate overlords should substitute their judgment for the judgment of “we the people.” No woke capitalists should be able to shape the outcome of an election by silencing speech. That is why we have to act, and act today.

There is a simple, straightforward solution to the censorship power of these digital platforms: Let those who have been censored claim their rights. Let them sue. Let them go to court. Let them challenge the decisions of the tech platforms and have their day before the bar of the law. Right now, Federal law prohibits this. It prevents Americans from challenging the tech platforms and their censorship. It prevents Americans from challenging just about anything that the tech companies do.

That should change. That is why today I urge this body to adopt my legislation, which I have proudly introduced, along with Senators RUBIO, COTTON, BRAUN, and LOEFFLER, to give every American who is unfairly censored the right to have his or her day in court, the right to stand and be heard, the right to fairness and due process of law. This is a stand we must take in defense of free speech, in defense of our elections, but more importantly, above all, in defense of our democracy and the rule of “we the people.”

So I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of S. 3983 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I just want to say in the Senate, in my time in this body, this is one of the most stunning abuses of power I have seen in my time of public service.

I think my colleague knows that I was sitting until 5 minutes ago in the Ways and Means Committee, where I was invited to testify about Social Security, and I was given a message that the Senator from Missouri was going to stand up and basically try to throw in the garbage can a bipartisan law that I and a conservative Republican, former Congressman Chris Cox—well known to conservatives—wrote because as we thought about the formulation of technology policy, our big concern was for the little guy, for the person who

didn’t have power, the person who didn’t have clout.

We were picking up accounts that if they were just trying to come out with their invention—might be something they put up on a website or a blog—they could be held personally liable for something that was posted on their sites that they had no idea about.

So we said: We can’t do that to the little guy. We can’t strip them of their voice.

By the way, my concern about the little guy that led to the passage of this law is something I continue to focus on today.

This law is hugely important to movements like Me Too and Black Lives Matter because it gives Americans the opportunity to see the messages they want to get out. We all see the videos. Frankly, establishment media wouldn’t even run a lot of it because they would be sued.

So the original interest in this was making sure that the little guy had a chance to be heard. That is the interest today. That is what the Senator from Missouri wants to throw in the trash can. That is No. 1.

No. 2, the effect of what the Senator from Missouri wants to do—and for colleagues who have just come in, I just learned about this 5 minutes before the Senator from Missouri came to the floor. The net effect of this is that Donald Trump can force social media—and he is already working the refs—to print his lies.

The thing that concerned me right at the outset was the lies about vote-by-mail. He wanted to force Twitter to print his lies about vote-by-mail. That, too, is something that we sought to constrain in the bipartisan law. And many people think the 26 words really began a policy of empowering the little guy to be heard.

Now, I am going to wrap up with just one point. Colleagues, the Senator from Missouri talks about how he wants to take on Big Tech. That is his concern. Let’s take on Big Tech.

If you want to take on Big Tech, you can go on my privacy bill. It is called the Mind Your Own Business Act. It is the toughest bill on the table with respect to Big Tech. It says that if an executive, a CEO, of one of the big companies, lies and lies repeatedly, they could be held personally liable, including the prospect of prison time.

So if the Senator from Missouri is serious about taking on Big Tech, I have a bill to do it. That is not what the interest is here. This is all about Donald Trump wanting to force social media to carry his political water and to print his lies.

For that reason—and I would have more to say had I been given some semblance of a courtesy to be able to prepare remarks on this, I would speak in more detail, but for those reasons, at least those three, I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I will just say to my friend, the Democratic Senator describes a world that just doesn't exist. He says Section 230 protects the little guy? Section 230 protects the most powerful corporations in the history of the world. Google and Facebook aren't the little guy. Instagram and Twitter aren't the little guy.

Do you know who is left vulnerable by those mega corporations? The people who don't have a voice. The people who, when they get deplatformed, don't have an option. If you are silenced by Google or Facebook or Twitter, what is your option? None. Nothing. You can't be heard. You can't go to court. You can't do anything.

Every American should have the right, if they are unfairly discriminated against because of their political views, to at least be heard in court.

Section 230, as it exists today and as it is currently being applied, protects the most powerful corporations. It protects and has protected human traffickers. It protects some of the worst abuses of free speech in our society. That is why I will continue to fight to have it reformed and continue to fight to give the American people a voice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am told the Senator from Arkansas is up, and I will be very brief. I appreciate his courtesy.

Once again, the Senator from Missouri is getting it all wrong. He talks again about how this law—this bipartisan law—is basically not for the little guy, but he is taking on the big guys. Well, the reason that is factually wrong is that on this floor, a previous effort was made to deal with sex trafficking. It was called SESTA and FOSTA, and the desire was—we are all against this horrible smut online. We are all against it. The desire was to block it.

As the debate went forward, I and others said: You are not going to be able to block it. You are going to be able to block Backpage, like what eventually happened under existing law, which I supported—not under this new thing.

Well, guess who supported this SESTA-FOSTA deal that is pretty much like the Senator from Missouri—it was Facebook. Facebook supported the last effort. Last time I looked, they are a pretty big company. So the Senator from Missouri is just getting it all wrong here.

I come back to the proposition—I see my friend from Vermont, who has been really the tech expert here—that what we have always been about is the little guy, and you see it every day with Me Too, Black Lives Matter, and so many voices from the community that, because of this law, can be heard.

I do not—not just on this, because I have objected, so it can't go forward—I do not accept this idea that this

somehow is the path to solving problems in communications, because under SESTA-FOSTA, which is really the kind of model the Senator from Missouri is talking about, the only thing that happened was the horrendous people involved in sex trafficking went to the dark web, and so now we have an even bigger problem.

Mr. President, I don't expect this will be the last time we talk about it, but I would like to repeat to the Senator from Missouri that if the roles were reversed here and I had an idea that I wanted to advance, I would extend a courtesy to give him an opportunity to prepare remarks.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, mercifully, I know of no further debate on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Gillibrand	Reed
Baldwin	Graham	Risch
Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Bennet	Hassan	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rounds
Blunt	Hirono	Rubio
Booker	Hoeven	Sanders
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Burr	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lee	Stabenow
Cornyn	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Cotton	Markey	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Warren
Ernst	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Perdue	Wicker
Fischer	Peters	Wyden
Gardner	Portman	Young

NAYS—2

Cruz	Paul	
Capito	Harris	Moran
Cassidy	Johnson	

The motion was agreed to.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2021 AND OTHER EXTENSIONS ACT

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 8337) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2021, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2663

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2663.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2663.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2664 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2663

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2664 to amendment 2663.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the underlying bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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