

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
Cassidy	Johnson
	Moran

NOT VOTING—5

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

move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 552, H.R. 8337, a bill making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2021, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Richard C. Shelby, Lindsey Graham, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Tom Cotton, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Mike Crapo, Rob Portman, James E. Risch, John Hoeven.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

(The remarks of Mr. ENZI, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 4684 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

REAFFIRMING THE SENATE'S COMMITMENT TO THE ORDERLY AND PEACEFUL TRANSFER OF POWER

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 718, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 718) reaffirming the Senate's commitment to the orderly and peaceful transfer of power called for in the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 718) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak to the resolution.

It is a shame that we have to come and reaffirm our commitment to our country, to our Constitution, and who we are as a people and how we became the greatest country on Earth and the freedoms we all take for granted many, many times.

Sometimes we hear things that challenge that. We heard that yesterday, and we were very concerned about that.

As of today, my friend and colleague from Indiana, Senator BRAUN, basically

wanted to reaffirm our commitment to the Pledge of Allegiance, which is something we should do every day—our Pledge of Allegiance to our flag and to our great country.

What we are doing with this resolution is basically saying that the bedrock of democracy is the orderly and peaceful transfer of power when a President transitions out. This should not be a question. There should not ever be one iota of interruption whatsoever at that peaceful demonstration.

I remember 1960. At that time, it was the race between Senator John Kennedy and Vice President Richard Nixon. It was very, very close. Everyone was on pins and needles, but there was an orderly transfer. Richard Nixon conceded, and to take this out further, he did a peaceful and orderly transfer, and away he went.

Then you had Al Gore—Senator Al Gore at that time, former Vice President Al Gore—and George W. Bush in 2000. We know how that turned out with the chads and all the hanging chads and the consternation of not knowing for so long. Then, basically, for the sake of our country, he did the right thing. Again, we expect that to be done.

We are in the most difficult times right now, and for the President to even address the subject of maybe not knowing if he would accept or not is beyond all of our comprehension that could ever happen in America, that it could ever happen in the discourse and the will of the voters, the verification of the votes and being able to protect the ballot box. We have come too long in our country, and we continue to be challenged.

I believe that to have the leader of the free world talk as if we are an autocracy—authoritarian versus a democracy—is something that alarmed me, along with colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Even as quiet as some may be, I know they are alarmed with that.

What we did is affirm who we are in the Senate and what we believe in. The resolution is very clear. All it says is that we affirm as the Senate our "commitment to the orderly and peaceful transfer of power called for in the Constitution of the United States" and intend that there should be no disruptions by the President or any person in power to overturn the will of the people of the United States. It is really who we are.

Mr. President, it is what you defended, what you fought for, why you entered the service. I am so proud of all the people who have served. Thank you for your service, Mr. President.

Thank you to all the people in West Virginia, the most patriotic people in the world. I have said this many times. I am so proud of my State. We have more veterans per capita than most any State; shed more blood, lost more lives for the cause of freedom than most any State. We never failed to answer the call. We have done the heavy lifting. Our people worked hard, includ-

ing my grandfather and all my relatives. We mined the coal that made the steel that built the guns and ships and the factories and defended our country and our great Nation. We are very proud of all that.

This is not who we are. This is not who we are, and we must speak loudly. This is not politics. This is not Republican or Democrat—make no mistake. This is basically saying that if you believe—for the sake of the Good Lord and all we believe in and our country, this is about maintaining this democracy. That is all this is about—maintaining. We will defend that.

Today, we have just reaffirmed our commitment to the orderly transition of power by the President of the United States, whoever that should be, whenever that might happen; that they must have an orderly transfer that we all will defend and uphold. That is what we affirmed today.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity, and I thank all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Thank you for standing true for who we are and what we believe in and what we have committed ourselves to.

I yield the floor.

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.

Mr. Kaine. 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

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I want to rise just briefly to pay tribute to Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

I saw a statement about her in the aftermath of her passing that said she will probably go down in history as one of the greatest women lawyers in the history of the United States. I don't think that does her justice. I want to take the floor to say that Ruth Bader Ginsburg, in my view, will probably go down in history as one of the top three judges and lawyers ever in the history of the United States, male or female. I want to describe why. Before I do, I just want to notice the outpouring of support for her.

In the 4 days after she passed, from Friday night until Tuesday night, my office received 37,000 pieces of correspondence about Justice Ginsburg, praising her, lifting her up as a role model, expressing concern about what the Court would be without her. In my 8 years in the Senate, I have never seen an outpouring of support for an individual like that. That is just an example of how highly we hold her in regard.

Justice Ginsburg is well known and particularly well known in Virginia. One of the opinions she authored that is one of her real pivotal opinions was an opinion that ruled that a public university—the Virginia Military Institute—could not deny access to women