

thought it would behoove everyone to listen to his own words back when he did it on CBS.

I—Me; an individual, a committee of one.
Pledge—Dedicate all of my worldly goods to give without self-pity.

Allegiance—My love and my devotion.
To the Flag—Our standard, “Old Glory”; a symbol of courage. And wherever she waves, there is respect, because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts “Freedom is everybody’s job.”

of the United—That means we have all come together.

States—Individual communities that have united into 48 great states; 48 individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose; all divided by imaginary boundaries, yet united to a common cause, and that’s love of country—

Of America.
And to the Republic—A Republic: A sovereign state in which power is invested into the representatives chosen by the people to govern; and the government is the people, and it’s from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

For which it stands.
One Nation—Meaning “so blessed by God.” [Under God]

Indivisible—Incapable of being divided.
With liberty—Which is freedom; the right of power for one to live his [or her] own life without fears, threats, or any sort of retaliation.

And Justice—The principle and qualities of dealing fairly with others.

For All—That means, boys and girls, it’s as much your country as it is mine.

Afterward, Mr. Laswell asked his students to recite the Pledge of Allegiance together, with a newfound appreciation and reinvigoration for the words: “I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.”

Mr. Skelton concluded his speech by saying:

Since I was a small boy, two States have been added to our country, and two words have been added to the Pledge of Allegiance: “Under God.” Wouldn’t it be a pity if someone said, “That is a prayer”—and that be eliminated from our schools, too?

Just as those students that day, Mr. Red Skelton included, recommitted to the meaning of the words of the Pledge of Allegiance, I call upon the U.S. Senate to recommit to the meaning of these words.

There are times today that the words of the pledge are tossed around without too much care. Other times, they are altered to remove what today is deemed offensive or antiquated, but Americans should not misuse or abuse the Pledge of Allegiance. The Pledge is meant to remind Americans of our guiding principles and inspire adherence to those ideas which make our country great: equality under the law and recognized rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 715, 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. 715) expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

Mr. BRAUN. 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. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.
The resolution (S. Res. 715) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.
(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

Mr. BRAUN. I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I just want to say how much I appreciate the resolution of the Senator from Indiana. It reminds me of discussions I know all of us have had about the teaching of American history and civics in our schools and, frankly, a collective concern that our children are being raised and educated without learning both about our founding principles and how unique we are as a nation. I think, as modest a step as this may seem, it is an important one, and I congratulate our friend from Indiana for taking it.

SUPREME COURT NOMINATIONS

Madam President, in a letter to our Democratic colleagues earlier this week, my friend, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, pointed out the vastly different treatment of Supreme Court nominees by the respective political parties.

He wrote: “Compare the treatment of Robert Bork, Clarence Thomas, Samuel Alito, and Brett Kavanaugh to that of Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Sonia Sotomayor, and Elena Kagan, and it’s clear that there already is one set of rules for a Republican president and another set of rules for a Democrat president.”

This double standard is not just fiction or our imagination at play. Two years ago, we saw the outrageous smear campaign that our Democratic colleagues waged against Justice Brett Kavanaugh and his family. I have noted that it is not just enough to defeat a nomination; they actually were out to destroy his reputation.

While I hope it is something no nominee will have to endure again, I worry that history will repeat itself. The President has yet to even announce his nominee for the Supreme Court for the vacancy created by the death of Justice Ginsburg, but our Democratic colleagues are already reflexively taking potshots at potential nominees.

One of those potential nominees is Judge Amy Coney Barrett, who is a well-respected Federal judge with an impressive background as a legal scholar. While serving on the Seventh Circuit, Judge Barrett has shown that she will faithfully and impartially apply the law to cases and controversies before her, but in the eyes of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, her stellar resume has one glaring flaw—her strong Catholic faith.

During Judge Barrett’s confirmation hearing for her current position on the circuit court, the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary asked Judge Barrett if she could separate her religious beliefs from her legal duties, saying: “The dogma lives loudly within you, and that’s a concern.”

During my time in the Senate, I don’t recall any similar application of a religious test to a nominee or such intrusive questions about how their faith might impact their abilities to carry out the duty of a Justice. But, apparently, some on the other side of the aisle believe that a Christian woman is unable to separate her religious beliefs from her role on the bench. Yet, again, there is a different standard for nominees of a Republican President. But the Constitution provides that “no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.” In other words, it is unconstitutional to impose a religious test on a nominee or on any person who holds public office.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues’ efforts to destroy conservative nominees are getting more and more outrageous—false accusations, religious tests, and threats to upend institutions, like packing the Court. It is terrifying to imagine what might come next.

In 2016, the American people elected President Trump knowing the type of nominees he would send us because he advertised and released a list of potential nominees to the Supreme Court were he elected.

At the same time, the American people also reelected a Senate majority committed to supporting the President’s nominees to the Federal bench. On both counts, we delivered, first, with the confirmation of Justice Gorsuch and, then, with the confirmation of Justice Kavanaugh.

We are once again prepared to deliver on our promise to the American people and to consider another highly qualified jurist to the Supreme Court. We will not rush this process. My colleagues and I on the Judiciary Committee will do our job and thoroughly examine the nominee, just as we would any other nominee to the Court.

Then, every single Member of the Senate will have the chance to debate and vote for or against that nominee right here on the Senate floor. This confirmation will be as thorough as it always has been, but my hope is that this time it will also be civil, and that