

Leader MCCONNELL tried the same stunt last month. It failed. Instead of trying to work with the Democrats or increase the size of the relief package to meet the needs—the desperate needs—of the American people, Leader MCCONNELL is back with the same sorry excuse for a bill. It fails to include robust unemployment insurance, enough funding for schools and universities, or funding for rental, housing, or nutrition assistance. It does nothing for the census or our elections and abandons State, local, and Tribal governments on the brink of catastrophe. It doesn't include recent bipartisan legislation that helps independent music and theater venues—the Save our Stages Act—or bipartisan legislation to help our ailing restaurants. It is totally inadequate when it comes to funding for testing and tracing, especially given the new spike in cases and especially given the fact that a second wave may be upon us. I hope and pray it isn't. It, once again, includes the poison pill of all poison pills—a sweeping corporate immunity provision that would shield corporations from accountability if they put their workers in harm's way.

Let me be clear: The Republican proposal was unacceptable a month ago, and it remains unacceptable now, even more so in that the crisis has gotten even worse.

Remember, Leader MCCONNELL has been clear that as many as 20 Republican Senators don't want to provide any more relief to the American people. According to press reports, one Senator said: "Not another dime." Republican Senators gave their counterparts in the White House an earful for even considering a bigger package of aid. So this is not a serious attempt at pandemic relief. It seems to be another attempt at giving the Republicans political cover before the election.

Speaker PELOSI continues to negotiate with Secretary Mnuchin and the White House in the hopes of finding a deal that would actually meet the needs of the American people. Instead of repeating the same failed partisan gambit, Leader MCCONNELL should be working with the Democrats and the administration on a proposal that actually has a chance of making it through both Houses of Congress. The longer he waits, the greater the cost to the American people.

Now, before I yield the floor, I want to be clear about one thing. Because our Republican colleagues have made such a mockery of the Supreme Court confirmation process, we are not going to have business as usual here in the Senate. Tonight, I will move to bring up a vote under the Congressional Review Act and force action on a resolution to undo the Trump administration's gutting of the Community Reinvestment Act. This is an important fight in its own right. We should be standing up for critical civil rights laws, like the Community Reinvestment Act—laws that help deliver op-

portunity and resources to communities of color.

The Trump administration's rewrite of the rule not only undermines core elements of the CRA, but it replaces past practices with complicated requirements that would lead to less lending in communities that need it most. I have fought too hard throughout my career to lift up the protections of the CRA to stand idly by as the Trump administration tries to tear them down.

The window to challenge this rule under the Congressional Review Act closes today, so I will move to consider the resolution this evening. Normally, we would work these votes out with the majority, but its abuse of the Supreme Court process means we will not have business as usual—not now, not until the Republicans stop their mad dash to confirm a Supreme Court Justice mere days before a Presidential election.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY RELATING TO "COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT REGULATIONS"—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 90, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to "Community Reinvestment Act Regulations," which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 90, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to "Community Reinvestment Act Regulations".

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 90 occur at 5:45 p.m. today, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

CENSORSHIP AND SOCIAL MEDIA

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it doesn't take a genius to figure out that there is a small but very loud sector of

the American people who are willing to condition their tolerance for diverging viewpoints on how they feel, they themselves feel about what is being said, worshipped, or reported. And as scary and as frightening as that attitude is to many of us, it is increasingly reflected in the very companies that have the most influence over how we access and consume information.

Last week, we saw two of these companies go to extremes to get in line with radicals who are trying to block, censor, and intimidate their way into power. We all know the companies and the controversy I am talking about. Twitter and Facebook censored the spread of a New York Post article containing allegations that could potentially affect the outcome of the upcoming election.

That is all I am going to say about the article itself because, frankly, the content bears no importance on how anyone should react to what happened after it was posted. Someone working for a private company—someone who is a content reviewer or content moderator—someone working for a private company made a unilateral decision to stop Americans from reading the article. They didn't like it. They said: I have the power to stop it, and because I have that power, I am going to stop it.

Now that is precisely what happened, and I will tell you, colleagues, it is not just that they blocked the link and the text of the article, it is that at least in Twitter's case, they suspended the Trump campaign's account; they suspended the New York Post account; they locked the White House Press Secretary's account; and they suppressed information posted by the House Judiciary Committee Republicans. They couldn't even provide a plausible explanation for why they did this. Think about that.

They made themselves the arbiters of free speech, and they, in their almighty position, decided they were going to determine what you could hear, when you could hear it, and how you could hear it. They decided.

The common element, of course, in all of this action that took place was the New York Post story. Was it information or hacked information or just inconvenient information? No one seems to want to answer that question. Why do they not want to answer that question? It is because they didn't like the information. It did not suit their narrative, but the way things stand, they didn't have to, because there is no real accountability and now their weak explanations have been co-opted into arguments made by activists, rival media organizations, and even journalists who were insisting that the information is harmful and must be stricken from the record.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would the Senator yield? I have brought an announcement to the floor that will take a brief minute. I don't mean to interrupt.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I would be happy to yield to the Democratic leader.