

Federal Government archive investigative files on the al-Qaida terrorists and foreign nationals who may have assisted. As much as we expected justice, the Federal Government denied them those records and documents that are vital to their cause.

So 17 years after this national tragedy, the appropriate declassification releasing these documents poses no threat to our national security, and there is no reason for the Federal Government to resist their requests. These files have been kept secret for too long. That secrecy contradicts the national interest. Their cause serves our national security, not only because it gives them justice individually, but it also deters terrorists in the future. Denying them access to this important evidence is unjust, unfair, and unwise.

The U.S. Government should make public any evidence of links between the Saudi Arabian Government officials and the support network inside the United States used to aid and abet the 9/11 hijackers. The legal and moral responsibility of our government is to provide its citizens with all available information regarding this horrific tragedy on September 11, 2001, particularly where there may be evidence that foreign nationals conspired within our borders to support terror with the assistance of foreign governments.

This resolution would never have been possible without the efforts of my constituent Brett Eagleson, of Middletown, CT. He was 15 years old when his father Bruce was lost to him in that massive, unspeakable destruction. He was on the 17th floor of Tower 2 of the World Trade Center. Brett was joined in his advocacy and efforts by members across the country of the 9/11 Families and Survivors United for Justice Against Terrorism. That group is a profile in courage, reliving the pain and anguish of those days in their efforts to seek justice for all Americans. They include a number of individuals whose names I wish to place in the RECORD: Mary Fetchet of New Cannan, who lost her son; Gordon Haberman of Wisconsin, who lost his daughter; Carol Ashley of Long Island, who lost her daughter; Tim Frolich, a survivor from New York City; Sharon Premoli, a survivor from Vermont; Loreen Sellitto from Florida, who lost her son; and Charles Wolf of New York City, who lost his wife. I thank each of them and the many others who supported this effort for their courage and strength.

There are so many we honor today by our passage of this sense-of-the-Senate resolution. This Senate resolution is itself succinct but significant. It resolves that it is the sense of the Senate that documents related to the events of September 11, 2001, should be declassified to the greatest extent possible; and, two, that the survivors, the families of the victims, and the people of the United States deserve answers about the events and circumstances surrounding the September 11 terrorist attack upon the United States.

Many years later, the pain and grief they endure on that horrific day is still with them. Each year in Connecticut we commemorate this day, and we will never forget. That is our resolve—never to forget, never to yield to hopelessness, never to allow our support for these families to diminish.

This sense-of-the-Senate resolution makes real the promise the Nation made to these 9/11 families. They deserve this evidence. Even if it is embarrassing to foreign governments or foreign nationals, they deserve justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 610 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 610) urging the release of information regarding the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks upon the United States.

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. 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. 610) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of August 21, 2018, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, 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.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak about Judge Kavanaugh's nomination to the Supreme Court.

I urge my colleagues to actually listen to Dr. Blasey Ford and treat her with the respect that she deserves. She deserves better than the setup she is walking into tomorrow.

I want to take a step back for a second and look at the big picture of what is actually going on with this nomination. We have a nominee for a lifetime appointment to the highest Court in the land who has been accused,

credibly, of sexual assault. Dr. Blasey Ford reluctantly came forward out of civic duty and said that Brett Kavanaugh tried to rape her in high school. She is now facing death threats for her courage, and her worst fears of how she would be treated by this body have come to fruition.

Another woman, Deborah Ramirez, agreed to tell her story after being contacted by a reporter—again, risking her career and her safety—and said that Brett Kavanaugh exposed himself to her face in college while laughing, as part of a game.

These accusations are disturbing enough by themselves, but the response to these allegations by our colleagues are so disappointing. Take a look at how Dr. Blasey Ford is being bullied because she told her story. Listen to how she is being patronized and dismissed by some Members of the Judiciary Committee. Look at how our President belittled and demeaned Dr. Blasey Ford and Ms. Ramirez, reminding us once again that he has been credibly accused of committing sexual assault himself and denigrates not just women who accuse him but survivors everywhere.

That is not all. The chief counsel of the Senate Judiciary Committee tweeted after Dr. Blasey Ford's sexual assault allegation: "Unfazed and determined. We will confirm Judge Kavanaugh."

According to Ms. Ramirez's lawyer, the Judiciary Committee isn't even interested in taking her claims seriously or getting information from her about her claims. Instead of getting the facts—instead of even wanting the facts—they try to dismiss this as a smear campaign and plow right ahead.

For anyone who has ever wondered why so many survivors of sexual assault don't come forward—obviously, there is trauma, but there is also the fear of this very kind of retaliation and scorn. The question I have, that I know you have: Do we value women in this country? Do we listen to women when they tell us about sexual trauma? Do we listen to their stories about how their lives have been forever scarred? Do we take their claims seriously or do we just disbelieve them as a matter of course?

I want to echo the words of my colleague from Alaska: "It is about whether or not a woman who has been a victim at some point of her life is to be believed."

I believe Dr. Blasey Ford. Here is why I believe her. She has risked everything—her own safety—to come out on the record to say Brett Kavanaugh sexually assaulted her. She told her therapist and her husband about it 5 years ago. She told a friend about it a year ago. She told a reporter about it before Kavanaugh was ever named. She has even taken a lie detector test.

Why are my colleagues moving so fast, as fast as they possibly can, to confirm this judge?

This process is sending the worst possible message to girls and boys everywhere. It is telling American women that your voices don't matter. It is telling survivors everywhere that your experiences don't count, that they are not important, and that they are not to be believed. We are saying that women are worth less than a man's promotion. That is not how the world is in 2018, and we cannot allow this Senate, this body, to take us back to before 1991.

To those whom I hear say over and over that this isn't fair to Judge Kavanaugh, that he is entitled to due process and to the presumption of innocence until proven guilty and that Dr. Blasey Ford has to prove her case beyond a reasonable doubt, those are the standards for a trial. Those are the standards in criminal justice. We are not having a trial. This is not a court. He is not entitled to those because we are not actually seeking to convict him or to put him in jail. We are seeking the truth. We are seeking facts. We are seeking just what happened.

We, Senators—not staff members, not female lawyers—are being asked to assess his honesty. Is he an honest person? Is he trustworthy? Can we trust him to do the right thing for decades? To rule on women's lives for decades to come? Can we trust him to do that right?

This is not about whether he should be convicted. This is about whether he has the privilege to serve on the highest Court of the land for a lifetime. This is not a court of law. This is a job interview, and it is our job as Senators to assess if he is honest. Has he lied about his past? Has he misled members of the Judiciary Committee? Is he trustworthy?

One point, I think, that our colleagues are somewhat blind to, which I know the Presiding Officer is not, is that the last 2 weeks have been so painful for women who have experienced sexual trauma. Women have lived through this. So, when they are watching some of the most powerful people in this country disregard, distrust, disbelieve, minimize, devalue, unfortunately, it is painful for all of them. It is painful because you are tired of seeing the same old outcome every single time. You are tired of the scenarios in which the men are believed and the women are not. They can't believe their eyes when they see two women being treated with less respect and having less of a process than even Anita Hill received.

I quote a friend of mine, Amina Sow, who just disclosed today that she is a survivor. Her words are powerful and truthful and describe exactly the way many people feel:

The truth is our strength. We are each other's strengths. To the women who are struggling: I see you. I am sorry we have to go through this. Thank you for trusting us with your stories. I am heartened by them and honored to know about you.

I believe Dr. Blasey Ford because she is risking everything—her safety, her

security, her reputation, her career—to tell this story at this moment for all the right reasons. If we allow women's experiences of sexual trauma to be second to a man's promotion, it will not only diminish this watershed moment of the societal change we are in, but it will bring shame on this body and on the Court.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I am looking forward to a hearing that we will have tomorrow at 10 o'clock in the morning, at the request of Dr. Ford, that will give all of us an opportunity to provide a fair chance to her and for her to have her say. It is important that we do this because, during the last 10 days, it has felt like a series of small earthquakes. Actions taken and blunders committed by our Democratic colleagues have destabilized the normal confirmation process and timeline.

All of this stems from the fact that the allegations made by Dr. Ford were made to the ranking member and kept by her from other members of the committee as well as from the background investigators, who, normally, when allegations come up like this, protect the confidentiality and anonymity of both the accuser and the accused until they can be properly vetted. Yet that all went by the wayside when our friend from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, sat on this letter, this accusation. So we are where we are.

As a result of the unfairness to both the accuser and the accused because of the secrets the Democrats kept, because of the way these were leaked to the press and the pledges of confidentiality were violated, we know the nominee, Judge Kavanaugh, who has had six FBI background checks in the course of his professional career, has been subjected to multiple accusations that could and should have been brought up much earlier.

As I say, if it had been handled during the normal, conventional process, it would have protected Dr. Ford, and it would have protected the nominee from this circuslike atmosphere, and we could have gotten to the bottom of the allegation. We could have, hopefully, ascertained where the truth lies. Yet, under this approach, under this current situation—again, created by this failure to release the information so it could not be investigated until after the hearing—everybody loses. I think we all recognize the basic unfairness of this process both to Dr. Ford and to Judge Kavanaugh and that it did not have to be this way.

The process, as I say, has been patently unfair. That is why my colleagues and I have been insisting on a better way forward by returning to the process that is fair to all concerned. In the dictionary definition, "fairness" is defined as the "quality of treating people equally or in a way that is right or

reasonable." Another definition is "impartial and just treatment of behavior without favoritism or discrimination."

How are we to handle this accusation and this challenging difference of position on Dr. Ford's part, who said this attempted sexual assault occurred 36 years ago, and Judge Kavanaugh, who has stated under oath that no such thing happened? How do we get to the bottom of this?

The biggest challenge we have is time because I defy any one of us to try to reconstruct what we were doing on a given day at a given time 35 or 36 years ago. It is just impossible to reconstruct with complete fidelity and accuracy.

What we really need to be thinking about, I believe, is a fair process. We have tried to provide a fair process for Dr. Ford, under these unfortunate circumstances, to tell her story, but we also need to provide a fair process for the nominee. This should not be a precedent for how future nominations will be handled. We should learn from this terrible experience and commit to doing better. One way to do better would be to return to our basic values and principles in our government and in our country, under our Constitution, which guarantee the rights of a person who is accused of a crime.

I know the minority leader—my friend from New York, Senator SCHUMER—has said to Judge Kavanaugh that this is not a court, that this is a nomination, which, I presume from that, means, well, anything goes and that there are no rules. He has been accused of a crime—attempted sexual assault—and has testified under oath, under penalty of perjury, that no such thing happened. This is a very serious matter, and we need to take it seriously and not create a new framework out of thin air, which says, somehow, if somebody makes an accusation that cannot be corroborated by anybody else 36 years later, that that somehow satisfies our notions of due process and of protecting the rights of people who are accused of crimes.

Fundamentally, this is about fairness. People who have been accused of grave misconduct have a right to due process under our Constitution. They have a right to know who their accusers are as well as the nature of the charges being brought against them and the evidence that will be presented against them. Those are basic, constitutional, American rights that are consistent with our idea of what the government's burden should be when the government is trying to deny us our right to liberty or property or even to our lives.

We also know these rights include a right to speedy proceedings without unnecessary delays. Unfortunately, there have been plenty of delays for Judge Kavanaugh. Last week, we saw Chairman GRASSLEY patiently wait and wait and wait some more while the legal team and political operatives who represent Dr. Ford strung the committee along. I am sure Judge

Kavanaugh was wondering: What in the heck is going on here?

As we all heard during a televised interview on Monday night, he, unequivocally, denies the claims that have been made against him. Again, that is a serious statement because he does so under penalty of perjury. He said: "I know what is the truth, and the truth is I have never sexually assaulted anyone in high school or otherwise." Those are strong words and direct words, and they remind us of something important. It is the truth that the Judiciary Committee and the entire country should be after—the truth. But for the truth to be our goal this week, some of my colleagues need to dial down the rhetoric and quit presuming guilt based on an accusation and nothing else.

At a minimum, a fair process requires a partial and open mind on the part of those charged with determining a person's professional fate. My fellow Senators need to remain open to receiving and evaluating credible evidence presented at the hearing. Unfortunately for our Democratic colleagues, that ship has sailed.

Long before Dr. Ford's allegations were leaked to the press and made public, contrary to her wishes, all of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle on the Senate Judiciary Committee had said that they would vote against this nomination, so Judge Kavanaugh hardly has an open and impartial tribunal deciding his professional fate and deciding whether this accusation will remain a stain on his professional career and reputation for the rest of his life.

Then, as I said, there is also the presumption of innocence. The Supreme Court has said: "The law presumes that persons . . . are innocent until they are proven, by competent evidence, to be guilty." This is a fundamental bedrock of our constitutional system. It is non-negotiable. It cannot be conveniently brushed away by our colleagues across the aisle. It is not one of several options; rather, it is guaranteed under our Constitution. The burden of proof is always on the party alleging wrongdoing, not the other way around.

We have the logical conundrum, as well, beyond the constitutional one, where Dr. Ford has testified—at least in the letter—to an event occurring. Judge Kavanaugh said it didn't happen. He said: I didn't do that; I wasn't there. So unless the burden is on the person making the accusation, how in the world could the person defending possibly prove a negative when he says that it didn't happen and he wasn't there? It is impossible. That would be a presumption of guilt, not a presumption of innocence. That would turn our Constitution on its head.

That is why it is so important for us to hear from Dr. Ford, to evaluate the strength of not just the allegations but what corroboration, what other evidence, there is in order to find the truth.

We have learned from media reports that attorneys for Dr. Ford have affidavits of additional people who know the accuser personally, but according to USA Today, these simply indicate that these are things that Dr. Ford told her friends 20 or 30 years later, not witnesses of the event that she claims occurred 35 or 36 years ago.

Let's also remember that three other eyewitnesses Ms. Ford identified have said that they have absolutely no recollection of the events that she says took place—none whatsoever. These are people Dr. Ford identified as witnesses to the assault that she claims Judge Kavanaugh perpetrated. Yet the witnesses she identified said that they have no knowledge of such an event.

We also need to remember the context in which all of this is occurring. Sixty-five women who went to high school with Judge Kavanaugh have written a letter saying that he has always behaved honorably toward them and treated them with respect. That doesn't mean Dr. Ford is not entitled to be heard—quite the contrary.

She has a story to tell. As the father of two daughters, I want to hear that story. I want to compare it to Judge Kavanaugh's unequivocal denial and judge for myself the reliability of each. As a former judge for 13 years and an attorney general for 4, I feel that doing anything less would be shirking my duty.

We owe Dr. Ford our time, our attention, and our best efforts at discerning the truth. That means her claims will be tested, examined, and new information, perhaps, will be brought to light. At least that is my hope. That is the way it should be.

We are trying to clean up the mess created by an unconventional process of leaking allegations to members of the press after the background test was completed and after the hearing occurred rather than handling it the way that, as I said, it should be. We should have started with that process, not end it here.

What the majority leader described yesterday as a disturbing pattern should never have taken place over the last few weeks. Our colleagues across the aisle, catching wind of an allegation, refused to share it with the majority and, instead, waited and then made sure that it was leaked to the press at the most politically opportune time, when it was likely to cause the maximum disruption and embarrassment to both Dr. Ford and Judge Kavanaugh. That is no way for the U.S. Senate to do its business.

A search for the truth—if that, in fact, is what we are involved with, and I hope it is—should not involve delays and the withholding of documents. It should not involve orchestrated personal attacks on Members either. It should not involve a mob rule like what we saw at the first Kavanaugh hearing. It should not involve people sending coat hangers to offices or forcing committee members to leave res-

taurants, harassing them when they are trying to have dinner with their family.

People who hold a genuine concern for Dr. Ford would have honored requests for anonymity and privacy. That is what Dr. Ford specifically requested. They would have passed those allegations to the Judiciary Committee so that an investigation could have been conducted in a more timely and confidential fashion, and then they could be addressed during the hearing, if necessary, that we had earlier this month. That standard procedure would have treated Ms. Ford as a real person, not as a political pawn, and it would have left the Democratic operatives who have now been hired to dig up dirt out of the mix.

I want to say that throughout all of this, Chairman GRASSLEY has been exceedingly generous toward Dr. Ford, as we would all want him to be, even when his patience has been tested. I want to commend him, once again, because he has had a very difficult job of trying to run the Judiciary Committee, trying to be fair to the nominee and the accuser alike when this wrench, thrown into the spokes of the committee operation, has created more of a circuslike atmosphere than a deliberative process and search for the truth, testing the background of a nominee, which is something all nominees deserve. No nominee deserves to be dragged through the mud like this.

Chairman GRASSLEY has been patient because he knows how important this is and how much is on the line, not only for the Supreme Court but also for women across this country who see a little bit of themselves in Dr. Ford and want to make sure that their voices, like hers, are always heard.

Over the last year, we have been in the middle of an important national conversation on the topic of sexual assault and the way men have treated women. As I said, I have two daughters. As I mentioned earlier, every American has a mother. Some are lucky and have a sister or a spouse or a daughter, and I think all of us would want to make sure that all of those women in our lives would be treated with dignity and respect, were they in the same position that Dr. Ford now finds herself in.

Yet it is also important to remember that every person has a father. Many are fortunate to have brothers or sons or husbands, and we would want to make sure that all of those men are also treated fairly and with respect. We would no more rather have a woman's truthful claim be ignored than an uncorroborated accusation against a man be honored. That is fairness.

As we know, Dr. Ford is a real person, and so is Judge Kavanaugh—flesh and blood. Each of them should be treated with fairness, with dignity, and with respect. It is not just one or the other, which is the false choice that many of our colleagues have suggested. We can't pick one and dismiss the other outright and claim any fairness

or allegiance to our constitutional system and due process of law if we do otherwise.

As Michael Gerson, the columnist for the Washington Post, reminded us earlier this week, somewhere along the way this process devolved into one that is no longer about just winning arguments but about demonizing and destroying other people. It is not about winning arguments. It is not about winning elections. It is not about winning votes here in the Senate. This process has devolved into character assassination and destroying the reputation and lives of real people. It is not too late to change that.

This all calls to mind that famous line by Joseph Welch, a lawyer during the McCarthy hearings. He said: "Have [we] no sense of decency . . . at long last?"

Well, I think we still do, and I hope Republicans and Democrats will prove we have a sense of decency and fairness as we approach Thursday's hearing.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise today to urge the Senate to pass the Special Counsel Independence and Integrity Act. This is a bill that not many Americans have heard about yet, but it is a critically important bill for the Senate to pass and very important for the country. This bill will preserve the Justice Department's independent investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 Presidential election.

Since this weekend, there have been reports that the President may fire Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein from his position at the Department of Justice. This would be a gross abuse of power—a line that we cannot allow to be crossed without consequence. Mr. Rosenstein has a long career in public service and law enforcement. He initially joined the Department of Justice nearly 30 years ago through the Attorney General's Honors Program and rose through the ranks, serving as a Trial Attorney, as a Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Tax Division, and as a U.S. Attorney in Maryland for over a decade—a critically important job in our justice system.

As Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Rosenstein has overseen the Russia investigation led by Special Counsel Robert Mueller, which has secured indictments or guilty pleas from 32 people

and 3 companies, including Russian individuals and companies, as well as former Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort, deputy campaign manager Rick Gates, and other campaign advisers, including George Papadopoulos and Michael Flynn. Earlier this month, Mr. Manafort pleaded guilty to "conspiracy against the United States."

Mr. Rosenstein has played an integral role in ensuring that the Mueller investigation can continue without interference. Unfortunately, this work and Mr. Rosenstein's long and distinguished service at the Department of Justice could come to an end if he is fired by the President.

From day one, President Trump has systematically worked to obstruct Special Counsel Mueller's investigation into Russia's attack on our Nation. He has attempted to fire, to demand loyalty of, and to interfere with any official with oversight of this matter. By way of example, this is a President who fired the Director of the FBI and later admitted in a television interview that he had done so with the Russia investigation in mind. This is a President who has repeatedly attacked the very Attorney General he nominated, suggesting that the Department of Justice should do his political bidding. This is a President who has impugned the impartiality and the motives of judges who have ruled against his policies. This is a President who has continued to call the Mueller investigation a "witch-hunt" despite the fact that it has already produced dozens of indictments and guilty pleas.

In short, this is a President who believes the Department of Justice owes a duty of loyalty to him and him alone. Our Justice Department officials have a duty to serve the American people and only the American people. They swear to uphold the Constitution, not to genuflect to this President or any President.

Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein has upheld his duty to the country and our Constitution. If the President fires him, it will be yet another blatant attempt to derail the Mueller investigation, and it could very well be successful.

Rod Rosenstein supervises the Russia investigation, overseeing the work of Special Counsel Mueller and his team. He receives status reports, establishes the investigation's budget, and, according to special counsel regulations, has the power to "determine whether the investigation should continue." He therefore plays an integral role in ensuring that the independent investigation can continue to seek answers on Russia's interference in the 2016 election.

If Mr. Rosenstein were fired, it could compromise the Mueller investigation in ways the public can see and in ways we may never know through warrants that are never approved or resources that are diverted to other projects. This would be a decision by the President that would put us into uncharted

waters. It is therefore more important than ever that Congress step up and exercise the oversight that the American people expect from us and I would say especially here in the Senate.

Since President Trump entered office, the Republican majority has not discharged its duty to act as an independent check on the executive branch and on the President himself. The majority would not be able to abdicate its responsibility any longer if Rosenstein were to be fired.

Congress has a solemn obligation to act immediately—immediately—to protect Special Counsel Mueller's investigation and prevent any more interference from this administration. Senators in both parties have a duty to the American people to step up as a co-equal branch of government and ensure that the special counsel's independent investigation remains just that—independent.

For public officials and institutions with nothing to hide, an investigation which is independent is not a "witch-hunt"; it is an opportunity for vindication, a chance to prove that our institutions and the individuals who serve them are truly worthy of the public's trust.

At a time when the American people's confidence in our institution is low—very low—and when suspicion of wrongdoing is high, it is all the more important that the 2016 election activities of Russia, as well as the Trump campaign, be open for review. As the voice of the American people, we in the Senate must ensure that the investigation both continues and remains, in fact, independent.

The legislation to protect the Mueller investigation, the Special Counsel Independence and Integrity Act, is ready for a vote by the full Senate at any time if the majority leader would permit us to do that. It is a bipartisan bill that has been approved by a bipartisan majority of the Judiciary Committee. There is no excuse not to pass this legislation immediately. Day by day, each time the President attacks Robert Mueller or Rod Rosenstein or the rule of law, we are presented with more evidence of why this legislation is needed. That is why I have again come to the floor to urge Leader McCONNELL to bring up this bill for a vote. It is far past time to put country over party.

We must not forget that the special counsel is investigating an attack on our democracy by a foreign adversary. As a matter of national security, the American people deserve answers about what happened during the 2016 election. We cannot allow anyone, including the President, to interfere with the investigation and prevent the American people from getting those answers to very important questions.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Madam President, very briefly, I wanted to add a few comments with regard to the vote on Judge Kavanaugh