



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2020

No. 164

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we continue to trust the power of Your prevailing providence. In times of trouble, You keep us safe from harm. You strengthen us when all seems lost, enabling us to reach Your desired destination without stumbling or slipping.

Lord, Your plans are fulfilled in spite of our enemies. Surround our Senators with the shield of Your divine favor. Lord, inspire them to rejoice in Your might because of Your victorious guidance. Keep them from the paths of disgrace.

Look with favor, O Lord, upon us all, and may our service ever be acceptable to You.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business, please.

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

FILIBUSTER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, those on the other side of the aisle who openly say they will end the filibuster if they get the majority should have to explain why they continue to vote to filibuster important issues like police

reform and COVID relief. Do they somehow believe the filibuster is wrong in principle, or do they admit that they think there should be two sets of rules depending on which political party has the majority in the Senate?

If you think at a minimum that the filibuster should be used sparingly and judiciously, how do you justify voting to block even moving, even discussing, let's say, for instance, Senator SCOTT's police reform bill when you have been promised amendments by the majority leader and when you can always filibuster final passage if you still aren't satisfied after the bill has been discussed for a long period of time and a lot of amendments have been adopted? It is clear their position on filibuster is pure partisanship at its worst.

If there is any way you are going to promote the bipartisanship that the people are demanding, it is only in this institution of the Senate, where it requires 60 votes to get to finality on a bill and where you have pressure to do things in a bipartisan way or nothing gets done.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

SUPREME COURT NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I explained yesterday how moving ahead on a vote on the forthcoming Supreme Court nomination will be consistent with both history and precedent.

When an election-year nomination to fill an election-year vacancy occurs in a divided government, with a Senate and a President of different parties, the historical norm is that such nominations are not confirmed. But the times this has happened after the American people have elected a Senate majority

to work alongside the same-party President, every such nominee has been confirmed, save one bizarre exception of a nominee who had corrupt financial dealings. Let me say that again. Except for Justice Abe Fortas and his ethical scandals, every single nomination in American history made under our present circumstances has ended in a confirmation—seven out of eight.

That is the thing about facts and history. Angry rhetoric does not change them. Partisan finger-pointing does not alter them. Facts simply exist. They are there for everyone to see. History and precedent were on this Senate majority's side in 2016, and they are overwhelmingly on our side now.

If we go on to confirm this nomination after a careful process, then both in 2016 and in 2020, this Senate will simply have provided the typical, normal outcome in each scenario. Think about that fact and then weigh it against the outcry and hysteria that has already erupted on the far left.

Yesterday, the Democratic leader announced on the floor that if the Senate holds a vote on the forthcoming nomination it would "spell the end of this supposedly great deliberative body." Spell the end of this supposedly great deliberative body? That is what he said. It would be the death of the Senate if a duly elected majority of the U.S. Senate exercises its advice and consent power as it sees fit. That is what Senates do. It is our job description. Presidents makes nominations as they see fit, and Senate majorities either provide or withhold advice and consent as we see fit. But now our Democratic colleagues tell us that the Senate doing normal senatorial things would "spell the end" of this institution—whatever that may mean.

The Democratic leader is not alone in these pronouncements. Chairman JERRY NADLER of the House Judiciary Committee has already announced that if the Senate majority dares to act like

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5733