

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

SUPREME COURT NOMINATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, let me thank all of my colleagues who were here until late last night and made such persuasive arguments as to why the new Supreme Court Justice matters so much to the American people, to their healthcare, the working people's rights, to women's rights, to preserving the right to choose, to making sure we have a good green planet, to LGBTQ rights. They did an eloquent job.

I hope America was listening because this nomination matters; it matters to the average daily lives of average Americans. And last night, by holding the floor until the late hours, Democrats made really strong arguments.

I thank my colleagues for doing that.

Madam President, for the third day in a row, Leader McConnell has come to the floor and completely ignored the "principle" he established in 2016, when, mere hours after Justice Scalia passed away, Leader McConnell said that "the American people should have a voice in the selection of their next Supreme Court Justice"—his words: "The American people should have a voice in the selection of their next Supreme Court Justice," referring to the upcoming election.

That election was more than 8 months away. We are now only 42 days away. But the so-called McConnell rule—the supposed principle that the American people deserve a voice in the selection of a Supreme Court Justice—hasn't come up. The Republican leader can't mention it. No wonder he never mentions it. And he sticks to just diversionary, irrelevant remarks in his speeches on the floor instead of addressing the main issue—why he said one thing in 2016 and a different thing now.

Instead, the Senate is forced to suffer these tortured explanations and misleading precedents. At a press conference yesterday, here is how the Republican leader described the Senate role in confirming the Supreme Court Justices. He actually said: "[W]e have an obligation under the Constitution [to consider a Supreme Court Justice] . . . should we choose to take advantage of it."

Did you catch that? Did you catch that? It is an obligation, but only if the Republican leader chooses to take advantage of it. I see. So, when there is a Democratic President, it is one of those obligations you don't have to take advantage of, but when there is a Republican President, it is a solemn constitutional duty.

Are we really supposed to swallow the argument that, when the Senate and the President are of the opposite party, one rule applies, but when they

are of the same party, a different rule applies? I didn't hear that right after Scalia died when Leader McConnell explained why he was holding it up.

So this idea that when it is one party, one rule applies and another party, a different rule applies, we have a term for that. It is called a double standard.

If the leader really wants to discuss precedent—real precedent, not fiction—we can dispatch with that conversation in about 30 seconds.

Madam President, I have a parliamentary inquiry for the Chair: Is there a Senate precedent for confirming a Supreme Court nominee between July and election day in a Presidential year?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Materials from the offices of the Secretary of the Senate do not show such a precedent.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Madam President.

July is long gone. August is over. We are now at the end of September. As you just heard—not from the Democratic leader but from the records in the Senate, as spoken by the Chair, there is no, no, no precedent for confirming a Supreme Court Justice between July and election day. The Republican leader can come up with arguments that twist things, that jump through hoops, but it doesn't gainsay no, no, no precedent for any Supreme Court nominee being confirmed between July and election day. As you know, July is gone. August is over. We are now at the end of September. It is 6 weeks before an election in which some people have already begun to vote.

Simply, my Republican friends have no ground on which to stand—none.

There is no logic to excuse flipping their position 4 years apart, under the same circumstances. There is no justification for the Senators who said on the record that they would "say the same thing if a Republican president were in office"—"say the same thing if a Republican president were in office" they said then, but it doesn't apply now that we have a Republican President in office. There is no defense for the Senator who said: "Precedent set. Precedent set. I'm sure come 2020, you'll remind me of that." There is no place to hide for the Senator who said: "You can say that I said, let the next president decide. Hold this tape. I want you to use my words against me."

Why are Senate Republicans going to such extreme lengths to ram through a Justice weeks before an election, making a complete mockery of their previous "principle"? Why are they committing a power grab so egregious that it risks shredding the last vestiges of trust that remain between our two parties? For what? Because this is the only way for Republicans to achieve their radical, rightwing agenda—an agenda so far away from where average Americans think, even average Republicans, that they wouldn't dare bring such things on the floor of the Senate.

Unable to thrust comically unpopular positions on the American people through Congress, they have to try through the courts—a cynical strategy that dates back to the 1950s.

Republicans are sick and tired, for instance, of this annoying law, the Affordable Care Act, and that it keeps providing healthcare to millions of Americans. They tried to repeal it in the House just about a million times, and they tried here, too, in the Senate but failed by one vote. So now they have taken it to the courts.

President Trump and Republican attorneys general are suing right now to eliminate the entire law, including protections for up to 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions. In fact, President Trump is meeting with those Republican attorneys general at the White House today, this afternoon. Less than a week after Justice Ginsburg's passing, the President is meeting with the leaders of the Republican lawsuit against our healthcare law. Ostensibly, it is about how social media companies are biased against conservatives, but who wants to bet that the healthcare lawsuit doesn't come up? I would like for someone to ask them that.

If he cared about healthcare and the American people, President Trump himself would ask the AGs to withdraw their lawsuit. I am calling on him to do it right now. I doubt he will, given his record, given his lack of concern for the American people's healthcare, but he should. But, unfortunately, let's remember, President Trump already told the American people his goal. He said: "My judicial appointments will do the right thing, unlike Bush's appointee John Roberts, on ObamaCare."

He is about to make a Supreme Court pick while there is an ongoing lawsuit that seeks to eliminate the Affordable Care Act. Hear that, America? The healthcare law you want, the healthcare law you need, the healthcare law that protects you against overreaching insurance companies that will not give you insurance when you have a preexisting condition—President Trump has said he will appoint a nominee who will undo it, and we know he said it because of what he said about Justice Roberts when Justice Roberts opposed his view on healthcare.

Guess when the case is being heard in the Supreme Court, America. November 10, a week after the election. Is that why Senate Republicans are in such a rush to get a new rightwing Justice confirmed before the election—so that the Supreme Court can do what they failed to do here in the Senate—repeal this healthcare law, which protects so many Americans?

Leader McConnell slammed on the brakes while tens of thousands of Americans died from COVID, and now he is slamming his foot on the gas to approve a Supreme Court Justice who could rip away Americans' healthcare in the middle of a pandemic. Shame. Shame.

For 4 months, the Republican majority delayed a COVID-relief package while the Nation suffered, but 1 hour—1 hour—after the news of Justice Ginsburg's passing broke, Leader McCONNELL said "batten down hatches, we're full steam ahead" on confirming another rightwing Justice—a Justice who could undo Ruth Bader Ginsburg's legacy; who could rip away healthcare from millions of American families; who could decide there is no more right to choose for millions of American women—Roe v. Wade hangs in the balance here; who could crush unions for millions of American workers; who could make it harder to vote for millions of African Americans; who could end marriage equality for millions of LGBTQ Americans, like my daughter and her wife, who looked at each other this weekend and wondered, is our marriage on the line?

Average Americans are thinking, what are they going to lose with this new, hard-right, special interest-dominated Supreme Court if—if—our Republican friends have their wish, which we are going to fight every step of the way? The stakes of this election, the stakes of this vacancy concern no less than the future fundamental rights of the American people.

My friends on the other side will tell you that we are being hysterical, that they actually support protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. That is hysterical? Ask the mother whose son or daughter has cancer and can't get insurance and watches their child suffer. That is not being hysterical; that is doing what we are supposed to do, not what the folks on the other side are doing—rushing through a Justice who, in a very strong likelihood if that Justice gets approved, would rip healthcare away from the American people.

America, you have to ask yourselves, if Republicans will completely reverse themselves on a major principle whenever it suits them, what can you trust them on? How can you take their word seriously?

Republicans have praised the legacy of Justice Ginsburg with flowery words about her impact, but in the resolution I offered yesterday, they even didn't want to acknowledge her dying wish that she not be replaced until the next President is installed.

President Trump had the gall, the temerity, the baseness to suggest her dying words were not issued by her. How low can the President go?

Senate Republicans are working with every fiber of their being to confirm a Justice—despite her last wish, in contradiction to her dying, most fervent wish—who will reverse her legacy. This is not speculation. This is not hyperbole. President Trump has said again and again and again that he wants the Supreme Court to "terminate" the healthcare law. He made it clear he has a litmus test: Any Trump nominee must want to strike down Roe v. Wade.

For once, Republicans should be straight with the American people.

They are fighting to reverse Justice Ginsburg's legacy, not honor it. All of their speeches of praise run totally hollow and are belied by their actions.

America, you can't trust them at their word. You can't trust them to protect your healthcare, and you definitely can't trust this Senate Republican majority to protect you.

JOHNSON REPORT

Mr. SCHUMER. While the rest of the country was busy fighting COVID, Senate Republicans have been abusing the power of the Senate to conduct opposition research for President Trump's campaign.

This morning, the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee released his report, which reads as if Putin wrote it, not U.S. Senators. The bogus narrative of this report, peddled by a Russian disinformation campaign, was disproved by every witness who testified. Despite their zeal to smear Vice President Biden and his family, Senate Republicans found no evidence—no evidence—to support the conspiracy theories pushed by Putin's intelligence agencies.

Senators GRASSLEY and JOHNSON should reimburse taxpayers for the money they wasted. This entire disgraceful affair and the Johnson report should be relegated to the dustbin of history.

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. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John Charles Hinderaker, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

SUPREME COURT NOMINATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I don't think anyone is surprised that Democrats have not reacted well to the idea that President Trump will nomi-

nate a third Supreme Court Justice. After all, overreacting to Republican nominees is pretty much the Democrats' stock-in-trade. It doesn't matter who the nominee is. To hear the Democrats tell it, any Republican nominee is likely to bring about Armageddon.

The fact that some Republican nominees in past years, and as recently as this past June, have sided with the liberal wing of the Court more often than I would like has not in any way restrained Democrats' hysteria each time a new Republican nominee is introduced.

I thought we had reached a low point 2 years ago with the nomination of Justice Kavanaugh, who suffered months of character assassination at the hands of Democrats, but it turns out that was not the low point because we have reached a new low.

As I said, it is no surprise the Democrats have reacted with hysteria at the prospect of President Trump nominating another Supreme Court Justice. It was disappointing—but hardly surprising—that yesterday the Democratic leader blocked a key Intelligence Committee hearing on election security, a topic he has repeatedly insisted is of overwhelming importance, to protest the thought of the Senate fulfilling its advice and consent role and confirming a principled, conservative woman. Even Speaker PELOSI's overwrought statement that Republicans are "coming after your children," seemed pretty much par for the course.

Democrats have not limited themselves to temper tantrums. No, Democrats have moved on to threats. Dare to confirm the President's duly nominated nominee, Democrats are now saying, and if we win back the majority in November, we will eliminate the legislative filibuster and pack the Supreme Court.

In other words, if Republicans dare to fulfill the Senate's role of advising and consenting to the President's nominee, Democrats will upend our democratic institutions. They will eliminate the legislative filibuster, which is the Senate rule that helps ensure legislation that passes the Senate has to be at least somewhat bipartisan.

And they will pack the Supreme Court. For those who need a brief refresher on the concept of court packing, which had been largely consigned to the dustbin of history nearly a century ago, the theory is as follows: If the Supreme Court is not deciding cases to your liking, add more Justices to the Court until you start getting the decisions that you want. In other words, let Republicans dare to fill the vacant slot on the Supreme Court, and Democrats will keep adding Justices to the Court until they can be assured they will get the outcome they want in every case.

Yesterday, I referred to those Democrats as undemocratic. Why did I say that? They are inconsistent with democratic government. In our system of