

her on the Court. Even as her family was standing there, mourning her, he made that announcement. He tossed aside all precedents and principles and declared his intent to ram through a nominee no matter the cost. Despite all of Senator MCCONNELL's talk and promises 4 years ago—that, when a vacancy arises 269 days before a Presidential election, the American people should have a voice in deciding which President fills that vacancy, which is what he said when President Obama was the President—the majority leader is doing everything he can today to deny the American people a voice and, this time, with not 269 days but just 42 days remaining before a Presidential election.

Seeking a fig leaf of institutional cover, the leader is trying to conjure up yet another rule today that, essentially, there was an unspoken exception to everything he promised in 2016. I guess I didn't hear that unspoken exception. Apparently, the American people do not get a voice when the White House and Senate are under the control of the same party.

Pay no attention to the fact that this contradicts everything Leader MCCONNELL and many other Republicans claimed to believe ad nauseam for 10 months in 2016. Yet even this desperate hair splitting falls flat on its face. If the majority leader's 2016 rule to let the American people decide only applies when there is a divided government, then the unprecedented 10-month blockade of Merrick Garland contradicted the confirmation of Justice Kennedy by a Democratic Senate during the election year of 1988. As did virtually every other Democrat, I was one who voted for this Republican nominee.

The majority leader's abrupt about-face is not about following precedent, and it certainly isn't about principle. The blatant hypocrisy—and the belief that norms and principles apply only to the other party or apply only when nothing is at stake—is the result of something even more insidious. It is the direct result of the President's and the majority leader's wanting to bend the courts to their will no matter the cost—no matter the cost for the Senate and, certainly, no matter the cost for all of our courts across the country.

I will have much more to say about this. Make no mistake, the actions that we take during these waning days of the Trump administration will forever stain or redeem this institution in which we proudly serve depending on whether we go along with this or not. The 100 Members of this body represent 330 million Americans. We are entrusted to act in their best interests. Through our actions in the weeks ahead, we risk forever eroding the American people's trust and faith in our independent judiciary, and our actions will have a lasting impact for good or for ill on every American's most basic rights—the rights of equality and fairness—that Justice Ginsburg spent her lifetime securing.

We all know what we should do. We all know how we can make the U.S. Senate be as it should be—the conscience of the Nation. I fear that we are willing to close America's door on that conscience. Yet, today, I simply seek to honor Justice Ginsburg. She dedicated her life to the causes of equality and justice and made both a reality for millions of Americans. She has left us a rich legacy to cherish and, more importantly, to carry forward. We will be forever in her debt. A generation—actually, more than a generation—of women and all Americans have been inspired by her leadership and courage. Generations to come will have her trailblazing legacy to thank. Let's honor her memory by following her example, by recommitting ourselves to pursuing a more perfect union not just for the few—no, not just for the few—but for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, on Friday evening, the Nation learned the sad news that Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg had passed away.

From her time as one of the few women in the Ivy League, to being only the second woman ever appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States, Justice Ginsburg was and is an inspiration to generations of Americans.

Throughout her remarkable life, Justice Ginsburg fought to secure equal rights and opportunities for all. She was a champion of women's rights in particular and broke down gender barriers throughout both her personal life and professional career.

During this difficult and often divisive time, I think there is a lot we can learn from the way Justice Ginsburg interacted with those with whom she disagreed, especially her good friend the late Justice Scalia. If you looked at a diagram outlining the ideologies of these two Justices, these two would be at opposite poles. They shared very little in common in terms of the way they approached the job of being a Supreme Court Justice.

She was once asked about their close relationship, which stood in contrast to their vastly different views, and she said: "You can disagree without being disagreeable." Well, we have all heard that before, and it is absolutely true—unfortunately, not practiced enough. But I think that sort of approach should be a reminder to all of us about the importance of treating each other with civility and respect, even when the person standing in front of you or on the opposite side of a computer

screen has a vastly different world view from our own.

Our Nation is grateful for Justice Ginsburg's 27 years on the High Court and her incredible contributions to our history. Sandy and I send our condolences to the entire Ginsburg family, as well as the countless colleagues and friends she earned throughout her lifetime.

As Leader MCCONNELL said this morning, the Senate is preparing to fulfill our constitutional duty of advice and consent. Throughout history, there has been a Supreme Court vacancy 29 times during a Presidential election year, and each time, the President has fulfilled his duty to put forth a nomination. Of those 29 election-year instances, 19 occurred when the President and the Senate majority were of the same political party. All but two of those nominees were confirmed.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle have tried to compare this to the vacancy in 2016, but the facts were different. At that point, we had a President of one party in his final year in office and a Senate majority of another party. You would literally have to go back to 1880 to find an example of the Senate confirming an opposite party President's Supreme Court nominee during an election year.

The other difference is that President Obama was not on the ballot in 2016, so it made sense for the American people to weigh in. Do you think we would still be hearing the same arguments from our friends across the aisle if Hillary Clinton had become President and been able to nominate a successor to Justice Scalia? I think not.

Voters cast their ballots and not only elected President Trump but also a Senate Republican majority. In 2018, they expanded that majority following the confirmation of Judge Kavanaugh. If the American people had elected a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate majority, I have no doubt that Senator SCHUMER would act on that nomination as well.

Just as the Senate has always done, we will thoroughly review the qualifications and experience of whomever the President nominates. We should not rush that process. It should be conducted carefully and consistently with how the Senate has previously handled Supreme Court nominations. When that process is complete, the Senate will vote on that nominee sometime this year.

In some cases, the confirmation process has moved quickly. In the case of Justice Ginsburg, she was confirmed in only 42 days. In others, the process has taken longer and been significantly more contentious.

I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will try to restrain themselves from repeating the smear campaign that took place during Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation hearing, including the Judiciary Committee hearing. I hope they will refrain from making threats, like threats of packing the

Court in the future, which Justice Ginsburg herself opposed and warned would make the Court partisan, because if Democrats decide to add additional members to the U.S. Supreme Court when they are in power, then the pressure will be irresistible for Republicans to add other Justices to the Court, and it would look—and it would be clearly a partisan institution rather than an impartial judge of the law and the facts.

The President has every right to put forth a nomination, and we have an obligation to give him or her due consideration under our advice and consent responsibilities. As always, we will be thorough, and I hope, unlike last time, we can be civil and treat all with respect.

I am prepared to fulfill my responsibilities as a Member of this body and of the Judiciary Committee, and I hope our colleagues on both sides are prepared to do the same thing.

JENNA QUINN LAW

Madam President, there is no question that this has been a difficult year for our country, with division and disagreement taking center stage. That changed for a moment last week when the Senate unanimously passed a bill that I had introduced called the Jenna Quinn Law to protect some of the most vulnerable members of our country.

This bill carries the name of an inspiring young Texan who is one of 42 million adult survivors of child sexual abuse nationwide. As Jenna says, child sexual abuse is a silent epidemic. One in four girls and one in six boys are sexually abused before the age of 18. Those are shocking numbers. Sadly, these victims often stay silent for months, years, some for even a lifetime. As a result, they and countless other victims continue to be subject to abuse.

Interrupting this cycle of sexual abuse is Jenna's mission and one she has devoted her life to pursuing. She was the driving force behind what is now known as Jenna's Law in Texas, which requires training for teachers, caregivers, and other adults who work with children on how to recognize and report child sexual abuse.

The signs of child sexual abuse are unique from other forms of abuse, and correctly identifying these signs is integral to bringing children out of a sexually abusive situation.

After the Texas law passed in 2009, a study found that educators reported child sexual abuse at a rate almost four times greater after training than during their pretraining career—four times greater. It was one of the first child sexual abuse prevention laws in the United States to mandate this kind of training.

Now, more than half of all the States have adopted a form of Jenna's Law, but many States, including my State, which have passed these laws don't provide the funding for the training. Thanks to the legislation that passed the Senate unanimously last week, that is one step closer to occurring.

The Jenna Quinn law will take the successful reforms in Texas and other States and finally back them with some Federal funding for that essential training. It will still allow current grant funds from the Department of Justice, for example, to be used for specialized training for students, teachers, and caregivers to learn how to identify, safely report, and hopefully prevent future child sexual abuse.

This legislation also encourages States with similar laws to implement innovative programs to address and discourage child sexual abuse. It is a critical step to interrupting this cycle that is impacting children across the country and preventing more children from enduring this trauma.

My partner in this bipartisan effort was Senator HASSAN from New Hampshire, and I appreciate her help in moving this bill through the Senate. I hope our colleagues in the House will quickly take it up and pass the Jenna Quinn law so we can get it to the President's desk as soon as possible.

The COVID-19 crisis has underscored the urgency of this legislation. In April of this year, nationwide reports of abuse or neglect dropped by an average of 40 percent compared to the same time last year. Normally, this type of drop in reporting would be great news, but based on everything we know about the stresses and circumstances created by this pandemic, I fear that there is actually an increase in abuse. It just isn't being recognized or reported. We need to make investments now in the health and safety of our children and bring this silent epidemic to an end.

Speaker PELOSI has made clear that the House will stay in session until an agreement is reached on COVID-19 relief so there is no reason for the House not to be able to act on this consensus legislation. I urge the House to take it up and pass it—which has received unanimous support in the Senate—and support America's children at a critical time like this.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

REMEMBERING JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this weekend the United States of America passed a sad milestone—200,000 recorded deaths from COVID-19.

We are a nation in mourning. In addition to 200,000 family, friends, and neighbors we have now lost to this brutal pandemic, America is also mourning the loss of a historic champion of equality, a woman who spent her entire life, every ounce of her strength and talent she was given, in pursuit of

America's highest ideal: equal justice under the law.

Jewish teaching says that those who die just before the Jewish New Year are those whom God has held back until the last moment because they were most needed on Earth. So it seems fitting that Ruth Bader Ginsburg left this world as the Sun was setting last Friday, marking the start of Rosh Hashanah.

Years before, Ruth Bader Ginsburg made history as only the second woman ever to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. Even at that time, she had already earned an enduring place in American history. She has been called the Thurgood Marshall of the gender equality movement. As a lawyer and law professor, she was the mastermind in the 1970s behind a legal strategy that finally began to dismantle an American legal system that treated women in many ways as second-class citizens. Law Professor David Cole called her strategy “radical incrementalism.”

It is hard today for many Americans to imagine how deeply entrenched and how commonly accepted gender discrimination was in American law—and American society—before Ruth Bader Ginsburg began her legal crusade to make real for women the words carved above the doors of the U.S. Supreme Court: “Equal Justice Under Law.” The legal challenges she brought changed the way the world is for women and for all Americans.

Before she began her legal crusade, women were treated, by law, differently than men. Hundreds of State and Federal laws and programs restricted what women could do. Many jobs were legally closed to women. Many basic economic, social, and legal rights that we now take for granted were legally denied to women for no reason other than gender.

Before the legal victories achieved by Ruth Bader Ginsburg, a woman often could not—on her own—buy a car, open a checking account, get a credit card, sign a lease, obtain a mortgage, buy real estate, open a business, or obtain a business loan. She needed a man to co-sign.

Before Ruth Bader Ginsburg, women could be—and were—barred from public institutions and excluded from whole professions. They could be demoted or fired if they became pregnant. In fact, Ruth Bader Ginsburg herself was forced to accept a lower paying job at the Social Security Administration when she became pregnant, at the age of 21, with her first child.

Her legal strategy was cautious and strategic. Knowing that she needed to persuade mostly male judges—including an all-male Supreme Court—she chose cases that illustrated how gender discrimination can also harm men. She took up the case of a young widower whose wife died in childbirth. The man wanted to stay home to raise his son but was denied Social Security survivor benefits because such benefits by law could only go to widows.