

cases in good faith, applying the jurisprudential principles to which she is committed. Those are the basic criteria for being a good justice. Barrett meets and exceeds them.

And if you “believe in an ideal judicial temperament,” Professor Feldman went on, “then rest assured that Barrett has it.”

It is the same story from everyone—everyone—who knows Judge Barrett well.

The dean of Notre Dame Law School says she is “an absolutely brilliant legal scholar and jurist [and] one of the most popular teachers we have ever had here.”

One of her faculty colleagues said: “She is a principled, careful judge, admired legal scholar, and amazing teacher.”

Six young women who all studied under now-Judge Barrett say she drilled into them “the necessity of setting personal beliefs aside when evaluating the answer to a legal question.”

These objective qualifications and credentials are what matter most. Judge Barrett deserves to be judged by her record.

But a few more things bear notice. As our Nation continues to honor the trailblazing life of the late Justice Ginsburg, it seems fitting that President Trump has nominated another brilliant woman who has climbed to the very top of the legal field. Young women who know Judge Barrett well describe her as not just an excellent teacher but a gracious mentor and an inspiring example of female leadership.

As the only congressional leader not from New York or California, I applaud the President’s decision to look to the heartland. If confirmed, Judge Barrett would be the only current Supreme Court Justice with a law degree from anywhere besides Harvard or Yale—from anywhere besides Harvard or Yale. I would say this nominee would bring welcomed diversity on multiple fronts.

As I predicted last week, the far left is rushing to make this nomination about anything but Judge Barrett’s qualifications. The instant she was announced, they started with the same unhinged attacks they have recycled for every Supreme Court nomination by every Republican President since the 1970s.

Remember, the far left said Justice Stevens opposed “women’s rights,” that Justice Kennedy would be “a disaster for women,” and that Justice Souter would put the “health and lives” of Americans at risk.

Well, Saturday went like clockwork. The political left took one more look at Judge Barrett’s qualifications, gave up on debating the merits, and headed right at the same old scare tactics. Our colleague, the Democratic leader, informed Americans that this 48-year-old working mother was going to “turn back the clock on women’s rights.” This 48-year-old working mother was going to “turn back the clock on women’s rights,” so said the Democratic leader.

The junior Senator from California said the nominee would “harm millions of Americans.”

The junior Senator from Connecticut said “Amy Coney Barrett would create a humanitarian catastrophe.”

Well, here we go again. Here we go again. One of the preselected scare tactics is that Judge Barrett is out to steal Americans’ healthcare coverage. That is the claim. This mother of seven, including multiple children who were born or adopted facing preexisting medical challenges, is just itching to block families like hers from accessing medical care. What a joke. What a joke.

When Senate Democrats were trying to attack Chief Justice John Roberts, long before ObamaCare even existed, they claimed he had sought to “put millions of American consumers and families at risk of losing coverage.” They have been recycling these same attacks since before they even passed the law they now say they are worried about.

On this occasion, their entire argument seems to come down to a technical analysis Judge Barrett put forward in a 4-year-old academic paper about one part of ObamaCare, which Congress has already zeroed out in the meantime. Let me just say that again. The entire argument seems to come down to a technical analysis that Judge Barrett put forward in a 4-year-old academic paper about one part—just one part—of ObamaCare, which Congress has already zeroed out in the meantime.

These hysterical claims collapse under the slightest examination, but, sadly, they are just beginning. Three years ago, Senate Democrats’ bizarre attacks on Judge Barrett’s religious faith became a national embarrassment for their side of the aisle.

The senior Senator from Illinois asked now-Judge Barrett: “Do you consider yourself an orthodox Catholic?” This was actually during a U.S. Senate hearing. The senior Senator from California told her that “the dogma lives loudly within you. And that’s of concern.”

This was not, regretfully, an isolated incident. Over the past few years, multiple Senate Democrats, on multiple different occasions, have openly suggested that certain kinds of religious beliefs might disqualify citizens from public service.

In 2017, the junior Senator from Vermont, Senator SANDERS, told an executive branch nominee that he had made an “indefensible, hateful, Islamophobic” statement because he had articulated a personal belief that Christianity gets things right which Islam gets wrong.

In 2018, the junior Senator from California, who is now asking for Americans’ votes to be Vice President, attacked a different nominee for participating in the Knights of Columbus. The Knights of Columbus? This is a massive, noncontroversial Catholic men’s

association that is known for things like shoveling snow off church sidewalks and hosting pancake breakfasts.

“Were you aware that the Knights of Columbus opposed a woman’s right to choose,” Senator HARRIS asked, as though it were remotely controversial that a famous Catholic organization would subscribe to Catholic teaching on the right to life.

The junior Senator from Hawaii suggested this nominee would need to quit the organization, quit the Knights of Columbus to serve as a judge. You would think the national backlash to all of this would have taught the political left a lesson.

Here is what happened in just the past few days. The Associated Press, Reuters, POLITICO, Newsweek, and the Washington Post have already run up major stories on the Barrett family’s private faith practices. Each strongly implied there might be something worrisome or disqualifying if a Federal judge were a faithful Christian with strong ties to spiritual groups. POLITICO’s contributing editor literally went and peered around the physical grounds of a religious facility in South Bend so he could report what the youth group had written on their whiteboard. Less than 72 hours in, this is where we are. The elite class is already treating Americans of faith like exotic animals on display in a menagerie.

Look, I understand the far left had committed to opposing this nominee before she was even named. I understand some politicians have decided to oppose Judge Barrett before they even considered her record. But every time they choose to use the nominee’s personal faith as a political weapon, they will only be reminding millions of Americans why it is so essential to have judges just like Judge Barrett on the bench.

In this country—our country—citizens have religious liberty. In this country—our country—there is no religious test for public office. In this Country—our country—we have the right to seek the protection of the courts when our free exercise of religion is threatened. That is why we need judges like Judge Barrett who understand our laws and Constitution and will uphold our freedoms accordingly. If the reflexive opponents of Judge Barrett’s nomination want to argue otherwise, they will only be proving how much better she understands our Constitution than they do.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### UKRAINE INVESTIGATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Last week Senator JOHNSON and I released our report

about our investigation into potential conflicts of interest with respect to Ukraine policy during the Obama administration. My Democratic colleagues have attacked this investigation with unsupported and inaccurate allegations that this investigation is rooted in a foreign-sourced influence campaign. They have asserted that our oversight activities relating to the Obama administration are advancing a Russian disinformation campaign and have implied that we are “wielding that disinformation as a political cudgel.” Nothing could be further from the truth, so I want to explain.

My Democratic colleagues have publicly insinuated that I received the records from a Ukrainian national, Andriy Derkach, a Russian agent who has taken action to influence and interfere in the 2020 election.

Now, get this: I have praised the Treasury Department for sanctioning Derkach. I have neither received nor solicited information from Derkach. This is probably the third time I have come to the floor of the Senate to say this. Yet you still keep getting these accusations from my friends on the other side of the aisle. Now, the Democrats know that we have not received this information. Yet they refuse to stop repeating their false insinuations, and those false insinuations have resulted in Russian-based media repeating the Democratic disinformation, which is Exhibit A why the Democrats should have never created that false narrative in the first place. In fact, during the course of this investigation, the minority—not the majority—of the committee introduced Derkach’s disinformation into the committee record.

Foreign election interference should have no quarter in this country, and we must do everything to stop that interference. If only the Democrats felt the same about the Steele dossier, which is the very definition of Russian disinformation and election interference.

Our investigation is based upon Obama administration government records and records from a Democratic lobby shop, Blue Star Strategies. They aren’t based on any information that we received from a fellow by the name of Derkach. So if my Democratic colleagues think that those records amount to Russian disinformation, then that says more about the previous Obama administration than it does about the Johnson-Grassley inquiry.

Do you think my Democratic colleagues would have attacked an investigation involving Donald Trump, Jr.? Remember, I interviewed the President’s son years ago as part of my Russia investigation. I didn’t hear any complaints about my investigative work at that time. Funny how this has played out, right?

My Democratic colleagues have jammed up document production from government agencies and engaged in questionable political media efforts.

We would have been done with this investigation a long time ago if all that opposition hadn’t occurred, but here we are, and now the American people can see our work and judge our work for themselves.

I would like to remind my Democratic colleagues that the first step in this investigation was a letter that I wrote on August 14, 2019. That letter was about an Obama-era Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States transaction. That transaction gave control over an American company that made anti-vibration technologies with military applications to a Chinese Government-owned aviation company and a Chinese-based investment firm with established ties to the Communist Chinese Government. Reports indicated that a firm formed by Hunter Biden and Chris Heinz, the stepson of John Kerry, later partnered with a Chinese-based firm to purchase the American company.

Also at that time, Joe Biden was Vice President and John Kerry was Secretary of State. The State Department is an approval agency on the Committee on Foreign Investment.

Clearly, this transaction presented conflicts of interest, and that is exactly why I wrote the letter of August 2019 to the Treasury Department.

My Democratic colleagues like to say that we started this investigation as a result of the Trump impeachment. Well, the last time I checked, August 14, 2019, was well before the impeachment investigation began. That letter was also sent before Congress was notified of the Ukrainian-related whistleblower complaint and before it was made public.

No matter how hard the Democrats try to say otherwise, this investigation is rooted in nothing but simply good government oversight. That is exactly the type of investigation I have run my entire Senate career.

After the August 2019 letter, news reporting picked up the pace about Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma, the corrupt Ukrainian company, and the fact that his father was in charge of the Obama administration’s anti-corruption policy for Ukraine.

Now, just think about that for a second. Vice President Biden was responsible for carrying an anti-corruption message to Ukraine on behalf of the U.S. Government. At the same time, his son was making millions of dollars working on the board of a corrupt Ukrainian company.

To any reasonable observer, that is a very questionable fact pattern that deserves attention, and it got a lot of attention besides from GRASSLEY and JOHNSON. Documents made public as a result of the Freedom of Information Act and investigative reporting brought very fresh public attention and scrutiny to this fact pattern.

Reporting showed additional potential conflicts of interest with respect to Hunter Biden’s business dealings all over the world, not just Ukraine. Those

financial dealings also exposed how Hunter Biden and his business associates sought to benefit financially from their relationship with Vice President Biden.

As our report shows, Hunter Biden and his business associates had extensive connections to Russian or Ukrainian nationals. Their business association also extended to Russian nationals.

The report also shows that Hunter Biden, his family members, and business associates had extensive connections to Chinese nationals. The records acquired by the committee show that Hunter Biden and his associates and family members were connected to Chinese nationals associated with the Communist Party and the People’s Liberation Army. Those connections formed business links, which resulted in millions of dollars passing through company after company.

Some of those companies were associated with Hunter Biden, his business partner Devon Archer, and James Biden. The records show deep and complex financial relationships with Chinese nationals and how financially fruitful those relationships became.

As one example, records show that Hunter Biden opened a bank account with a Chinese national linked to the Communist regime and funded with approximately \$100,000. Then he, James Biden, and Sarah Biden went on an extravagant global spending spree. Records show that Hunter Biden, via his law firm, also sent over a million dollars to James Biden’s consulting firm, the Lion Hall Group. When the bank contacted Sarah Biden, who was associated with the firm’s bank account, she refused to answer the questions and provide any additional information and documentation. According to records we have on file, the bank submitted the account for closure.

Now, what is very clear is that Hunter Biden leveraged his name and his father’s position for financial gain, and his work with Burisma is just the tip of the iceberg.

These associations and the millions of dollars that passed between and among Hunter Biden, Archer, James Biden, and others create criminal financial concerns. Moreover, they create counterintelligence and extortion concerns.

The investigation also uncovered that the Obama administration was well aware of the problems that Hunter Biden’s board position caused. State Department officials testified that his board membership created the perception of a conflict of interest and was very awkward for all U.S. officials pushing an anti-corruption agenda in Ukraine.

Secretary of State Kerry publicly denied knowing of Hunter Biden’s role on the Burisma board. Now, we have acquired evidence that he did, in fact, know about that role.

The owner of Burisma was viewed as an “odious oligarch” by State Department officials. However, in December

of 2015, instead of following U.S. objectives of confronting oligarchs, Vice President Biden's staff advised him to avoid commenting on the odious oligarch and instead say "I am not going to get into naming names or accusing individuals."

Well, if you are running an anticorruption agenda in Ukraine and you pull your punches when it comes to Burisma while your son is on the board, that goes to judgment—and here it looks like very bad judgment and weak leadership.

Based on witness testimony, Burisma's owner allegedly paid a \$7 million bribe to officials serving under Ukraine's prosecutor general to shut the case against him. When he allegedly placed the bribe in December 2014, Hunter Biden was on the board and—can you believe this—he had been hired to be on the board to assist with what they call "corporate governance and responsibility." Obviously, he wasn't doing his corporate job—due diligence.

The facts show that the Obama administration was well aware of the problems that Hunter Biden being on the Burisma board caused. The facts show that the Obama administration turned a blind eye to it. Everyone knew about the problems it caused, but nobody wanted to do anything about it. So much for leadership.

At its core, the investigation is a good government oversight investigation. These are exactly the kinds of shady, backroom deals that the American people should know about. So now the facts are out there. The American people can judge this information for themselves. They don't need the people on the other side of the aisle of this institution telling them what went on when they were using disinformation from Russia and spreading that disinformation around and trying to say it was attributed to something that we got.

As for the next step, Senator JOHN-SON and I will continue to review the records that we possess and further records that we hope we are able to acquire.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, after Senate Republicans established the

principle that the Senate shouldn't consider Supreme Court nominations in Presidential election years, on Saturday, President Trump nominated Amy Coney Barrett to the Supreme Court with less than 40 days left in the Presidential election.

The Senate has never—never—confirmed a nominee to the Supreme Court this close to a Presidential election. In fact, the election is already underway, but President Trump gets to play by different rules under this Republican majority.

By nominating Judge Amy Coney Barrett to the Supreme Court, President Trump has once again put Americans' healthcare in the crosshairs. President Trump has promised to nominate Supreme Court Justices who will "terminate"—his words—our healthcare law. In Judge Barrett, President Trump has found the deciding vote.

Judge Barrett strongly criticized the ruling to uphold the Affordable Care Act, claiming that if Justices read the law the way she does, they would "have had to invalidate" the entire healthcare law. Let me repeat that: Judge Barrett strongly criticized Justice Roberts' decision to uphold the Affordable Care Act, saying that "he pushed [the law] beyond its plausible meaning to save the statute." If Justice Roberts had read the law the way Judge Barrett does, the Supreme Court would have had to invalidate the entire Affordable Care Act.

The Republican lawsuit against the Affordable Care Act, as everyone knows, will be heard 1 week after the election. Senate Republicans are rushing to jam Judge Barrett's confirmation through in time for her to hear arguments in that very case. Not one for subtlety, President Trump tweeted on Saturday that our healthcare law would be replaced "if terminated by the Supreme Court."

So the American people should make no mistake, a vote by any Senator for Judge Amy Coney Barrett is a vote to strike down the Affordable Care Act and eliminate protections for millions of Americans with preexisting conditions.

Judge Barrett's record also suggests that if she is confirmed, the reproductive freedom of millions of women would be in grave danger. Should Judge Amy Coney Barrett be confirmed, a far-right majority on the Court could turn back the clock on women's rights and a woman's right to choose, workers' rights, voting rights, civil rights, environmental protections, LGBTQ rights, and many more. The future for DACA recipients hangs in the balance as well.

So this nomination concerns no less than the fundamental rights of the American people. After holding a Supreme Court vacancy open for 8 months before a Presidential election, President Trump and Leader McConnell are doing what no Senate has done before—shamelessly rushing to fill Justice

Ginsburg's seat less than 40 days before the Presidential election.

Justice Ginsburg's dying wish was that she not be replaced until a new President is installed. Republicans are poised not only to ignore her wishes, but to replace her with someone who could tear down everything she had built.

This reprehensible power grab is a cynical attack on the legitimacy of the Court, and I would strongly, strongly oppose this nomination.

The Senate Republican majority has decided, however, that they will stop at nothing, break all the rules—even their own rules—to rush this nomination through before the election. But apparently the Senate majority isn't going to stop at naked hypocrisy. It is also going to engage in manufactured hysterics.

For the past few weeks, long before President Trump even nominated Judge Barrett, Senate Republicans have been telling everyone who will listen that Democrats "better not make Catholicism an issue in this nomination." That is their quote.

Last week, a Member of this Chamber wrote me an entire letter preemptively warning about anti-Catholic attacks against a nominee who hadn't been named yet. Another Member of this Chamber said that "in CHUCK SCHUMER's America—only atheists can be Supreme Court Justices."

Of course, not a single Democrat will make these attacks or make personal religious beliefs an issue, but that doesn't matter to my Republican friends. Oh, no. They will try to slander Democrats with this imaginary issue anyway because they are desperate for a distraction. Republicans invented this concern because they are so eager to make this nomination about anything other than their disgraceful double standard—anything besides their attempts to take away healthcare and curtail the fundamental rights of the American people.

Honestly, it is embarrassing how transparent Republicans are being about this manufactured line of attack. They couldn't even wait for a Catholic nominee to be chosen. They already scripted the attacks.

The Senator from Tennessee is making wild allegations; the Senator from Missouri is writing ridiculous letters; and my friend from Florida is cutting videos decrying the kind of attacks on a person's faith that haven't occurred since the political right was implying that our last practicing Christian President, President Obama, was a secret Muslim.

I don't remember my Republican colleagues making a fuss when peaceful protesters were tear-gassed so President Trump could hold the Bible upside down in front of a church for a photo op.

I understand why certain Republicans are resorting to this disgusting tactic: They have no other argument. They can't argue that this nomination