

It is so important that when we do this, we do this in a way that is thoughtful, deliberative, reasonable, and with an eye toward making sure we are getting a good return for the American taxpayer and delivering assistance in a targeted way to those folks who need it the most—unemployed workers; those who are employed; the small businesses that employ them; the healthcare frontline workers who are out there every day fighting this fight against this virus, making sure they have the PPE to protect them—and then, of course, the important investments we are making in vaccines and therapeutics and testing and all the things that will help defeat this; money for schools, colleges, universities, elementary and high school students and faculty and administration—those who are trying to keep our kids in school, keep them educated by dealing with a lot of additional costs related to providing that education in a safe way.

Those are all things on which there is broad bipartisan agreement. We could pass it today. We could pass it today in the Senate, but the Democrats insist on a liberal wish list, which includes a multitrillion-dollar proposal—multitrillion-dollar proposal—with a liberal wish list, an agenda that in many cases has nothing to do with combating or fighting the coronavirus but simply is an attempt to deliver on a liberal agenda for their political base. So let's just make that point very clearly here when we talk about what we should be doing.

I believe what we should be doing is sitting down and working on a reasonable bill, a targeted bill, a fiscally responsible bill. Republicans have been more than willing to do that and more than willing to compromise, but the Democrats both in the House and the Senate continue to insist upon a multitrillion-dollar bill that consists, again, of a bunch of liberal wish list items—taxpayer bailouts for blue States, tax cuts for millionaires across this country, putting money into diversity studies on cannabis—instead of the targeted things, the things that are really going to be necessary to help the American people and our economy recover from the coronavirus.

SENATOR CHUCK GRASSLEY

Madam President, as I begin today, I just want to say that our thoughts are with Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY after his coronavirus diagnosis. It was a strange day in the Senate yesterday with CHUCK GRASSLEY not voting, because he broke a 27-year-long streak of showing up for every single vote. We are praying for his swift recovery and his speedy return to the Senate.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Madam President, a couple of weeks ago, we confirmed one of the most qualified Supreme Court Justices in living memory. This week, we are confirming more district court judges, bringing the total number of judges we have confirmed over the last 4 years to nearly 230.

Confirming good judges is one of the most important responsibilities that we have as Senators, and it is a responsibility that I take very seriously. In fact, one of the main reasons I was first elected to the Senate was to make sure that outstanding judicial nominees were confirmed to the Federal bench.

It is hard to imagine now, but confirming judges used to be a pretty bipartisan affair. Presidents of both parties generally got the majority of their judicial nominees confirmed to the bench. But all of that changed back in the early 2000s.

After President George W. Bush's election, Democrats decided that the President's judicial nominees might not deliver the results that Democrats wanted, and so they decided to adopt a new strategy: blocking judicial nominees on a regular basis. That became the routine here in the Senate.

I was one of the many Americans who were upset by the blockade of impressive, well-qualified nominees, and it was one of the main reasons that I ran for the Senate in 2004. I promised South Dakotans that if they elected me, I would help put outstanding, impartial judges on the bench. I am proud to have delivered on that promise.

The list of outstanding judicial nominees we have confirmed over the past 4 years is long. We have confirmed brilliant, accomplished men and women with superb qualifications, but most importantly, we have confirmed men and women who understand the proper role of a judge, who know that the job of a judge is to interpret the law, not make the law, to call balls and strikes, not to rewrite rules of the game.

It is here that Republican judicial philosophy diverges from the judicial philosophy of a lot of Democrats. Republicans believe that the job of a judge is to look at the law and the Constitution and then rule based on how those things apply to the facts in a particular case. Judges, we believe, should leave their politics and their personal opinions at the courtroom door and base their opinions solely on what the law and the Constitution say.

For Democrats, on the other hand, what matters most is not how judges reach their conclusion, not whether they apply the law, but what outcomes they deliver. If a judge can deliver the right outcome by following the plain meaning of the law, then great, but if she can't, then Democrats want a judge to reach beyond the plain meaning of the statute to deliver what Democrats see as an appropriate result.

Then-Presidential candidate Barack Obama back in 2007 said:

[What you've got to look at is, what is in the justice's heart? What's their broader vision of what America should be?

Well, that is a very dangerous standard. It is not the job of a judge to impose his or her "broader vision of what America should be"; it is the job of a judge to determine what the law says and then apply the law to the particular case before him.

President Obama famously said that he wanted judges with empathy. Well, that is all very well until you are a party in a case, and you have the law on your side, but the judge empathizes with the opposing party. What happens then?

The only way to preserve the rule of law in this country is to confirm judges who understand that their allegiance must be to the law and to the Constitution, not to their personal feelings, their personal beliefs, their political beliefs, or their "broader vision of what America should be." Otherwise, you replace the rule of law with the rule of a bunch of individual judges.

So I am very thankful that we have confirmed so many judges who understand that the job of a judge is to apply the law, not make it, and who won't try to usurp the role of Congress by legislating from the Federal bench. I thank the majority leader for making judicial confirmations such a priority. I look forward to confirming more outstanding judicial nominees this week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Vaden nomination be waived.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Stephen A. Vaden, of Tennessee, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

Mitch McConnell, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Thom Tillis, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Todd Young, John Boozman, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Lindsey Graham, Roger F. Wicker.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Stephen A. Vaden, of Tennessee, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea," the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) would have voted "yea," and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 236 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lankford	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Young
Enzi	Paul	
Ernst	Perdue	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Jones	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	King	Sinema
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markley	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Grassley	Scott (FL)
Feinstein	Harris	
Gardner	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Wyoming.

2020 ELECTIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about what the voters of America told the elected representatives in Washington about the election earlier this month. There has been a lot of analysis about what happened this year in the elections—who got what right, who got what wrong. The pollsters, the prognos-

ticators, and the pundits—well, they are already taking a beating for their many wrong predictions.

The American people in States all across this country and, certainly, in Wyoming, rejected this far-left agenda. They saw what the Democrats were offering, and they said: No, thank you. Voters looked at the violent leftwing protests that have wrecked large cities and small cities across the country. People saw the death, injuries, and destruction of property, and Americans went to the polls and said: No, thank you. They rejected the Democrats' calls to defund the police; rebuffed the Democrats' threats to pack the Supreme Court; and said no to one-size-fits-all, government-run healthcare. They snubbed the Democrats' embrace of the Green New Deal and rejected this far-left plan to end American energy production. Basically, Americans said no.

Many Democrats ran on this far-left agenda. They lost despite spending hundreds of millions of dollars trying to convince Americans otherwise. The Democrats must be asking themselves: What did we get wrong?

No matter how much the Democrat Party pushes and their candidates push, America is not a far-left country. Americans don't want to blow up the Senate or the Supreme Court. They don't want to add more States to the Union or more Justices to the Court. They don't want to kill our energy economy and the good jobs it provides. People do not want to pay \$10 a gallon for gasoline when they fill up under the Green New Deal. They don't want more government meddling in their personal healthcare decisions.

I know what the people of Wyoming want, and Members ought to know this. Americans want jobs and security. They want to get back to work in a free enterprise economy, not a socialist one. They want their kids back in school safely to make sure they don't fall further behind. People are smart enough to know that the free stuff for everyone means the American taxpayer will be left footing the bill.

Between now and the end of the year, we have very important things to do for the Nation in this body, the U.S. Senate. We need to fund the government. We need to pass the National Defense Authorization Act. We need to confirm well-qualified nominees to the Federal judiciary. Senate Republicans are ready to get that work done. There is also work to be done in our fight against the coronavirus.

The Democrat House has played politics with American lives and livelihoods for months now. With the election behind us, I hope it will take a more sensible approach to this Nation's most pressing problem right now. For months, Senate Republicans put forward targeted proposals—first in September, again in October—that provided comprehensive coronavirus relief, that focused on the coronavirus. There were 52 Republicans who came to

the floor of this Senate and voted in favor of the proposal. Not a single Democrat voted for it. It is our plan to get people back to work, to get kids back to school safely, and to put the disease behind us.

Just last week, Pfizer announced a vaccine that could be 90 percent effective in the fight against the coronavirus. This morning, it found out, with more testing and more time, that it will be, actually, 94½ percent effective. Now Moderna and the National Institutes of Health have developed a vaccine that is almost 95 percent effective. There are four other vaccines in the trials, and one of the Members of this body, the Senator from Ohio, is part of the trial of one of those. I believe additional vaccines will be coming down the pipeline as well.

It was a front-page story yesterday in every major paper in America—the good news about vaccines and that the light at the end of the tunnel of the coronavirus is upon us.

Today there was an announcement of an at-home test for coronavirus—very, very promising.

But when we think about the vaccine and why this all happened, Congress wisely invested \$18 billion for vaccine treatment and for research, and it is paying off.

The Governor of New York, astonishingly, called this bad news. He said this is bad news. It had to do with the fact that this is coming out now, and he wanted it to wait for a couple of months, after a Presidential inauguration.

Why is it bad news that, through innovation and the work of the Cures Act, which came out of this body under the Republican majority and was then accepted by unanimous consent in the House—why is it bad news that we may be able to save millions, if not tens of millions, of lives all around the world? Why is it bad news, as the Governor of New York calls it? Why is it bad news that American invention and innovation and an investment by this body has brought about such a tremendous—what I would call as a doctor—modern medical miracle?

Now, we still need to provide additional funding for vaccine distribution, and there is going to be a briefing tomorrow for all the Senators on both sides of the aisle with Operation Warp Speed to talk with the heads of research and distribution about how to make sure we can continue on this path to success—a path that the New York Times yesterday described as one that could lead to 20 million people being vaccinated before the end of this year. Bad news, says the Governor of New York, because it came this year rather than after January 20.

It is distressing that an elected official would behave that way, in such a callous manner toward the lives, as well as the livelihood, of so many Americans.

We still have work to do. At every turn, Democrats have blocked our

path. They are keeping us stuck and America stuck in this coronavirus crisis by demanding funding for things unrelated to coronavirus, per the Speaker of the House. You say: Oh, no, she wanted this \$3 trillion for all sorts of things unrelated to coronavirus. She has more money in that bill to send direct paychecks to illegal immigrants—people in this country illegally—than she does for coronavirus vaccines.

That is the kind of opposition and leftist thinking that we have been running into here in this body and that the American people rejected on election day and said: No, we want a path forward. We want to continue the great American comeback. We want our jobs. We want our kids. We want that path forward.

There is still more work to be done, and we are ready to do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Oregon.

REMEMBERING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DELBERT LITRELL

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to recognize the distinguished service of one of Medford, Oregon's own and to ask my Senate colleagues to join me in support of the U.S. Marine Corps PFC Delbert Littrell's honorary promotion to corporal.

It is an honorary promotion because it was 75 years ago, in World War II, that Mr. Littrell served in the 14th Marine Regiment, 4th Marine Division.

His service was marked by a combat history of notable intensity and duration. He fought in five pivotal battles that together changed the tide of the war in the Pacific Theater: the Gilbert and Marshall Islands campaign, between November 1943 and February 1944; the Battle of Saipan, between June 15, 1944, and July 9, 1944; the Battle of Tinian, between July 24, 1944, and August 1, 1944; the Battle of Iwo Jima, between February 19, 1945, and March 26, 1945; and, fifth, the Battle of Okinawa, between April 1, 1945, and June 22, 1945. What an outstanding contribution to make to the fight for freedom, and what a remarkable bit of history to be part of.

As administrative officers noted while evaluating him, Private First Class Littrell performed excellently time and again. He should have received this promotion a long time ago.

The units he served in, however, were under constant enemy bombardment, and the kinds of performance reports and administrative submissions that would have given him that promotion were often misplaced or incomplete in the midst of the rigorous amphibious assaults pivotal to the Allied victory.

It wasn't until earlier this year, three-quarters of a century later, that the Marine Corps Advisory Panel reviewed the comprehensive record of Mr. Littrell's service to the Marine Corps and to the national security of the United States of America, and after reviewing the record, the Commandant

of the Marine Corps recommended Delbert Littrell's honorary promotion to the rank of corporal, which was endorsed soon after by the Secretary of the Navy.

Both of these leaders recognized Mr. Littrell's unique contributions, with the Secretary of the Navy noting the indelible mark that Mr. Littrell has left on the proud history of the U.S. Marine Corps and the U.S. Navy.

The State of Oregon and our entire Nation are proud of Delbert Littrell's meritorious service throughout World War II. Mr. Littrell's remarkable combat history and his actions in support of freedom mean that this recognition is long overdue.

I am proud that this son of Oregon, who I hope is watching right now, is finally receiving this special honor.

Colleagues, I know that you join me in honoring, respecting, and appreciating Delbert Littrell and his commitment to the fight for freedom and his legacy of service to our Nation with the distinction of corporal in the U.S. Marine Corps.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the American people sent a clear message in this election. They want us to get to work to empower people with a plan to fight this virus and to get people back to work, back to school, and back to their lives. They gave President-Elect Biden a commanding 5-million vote victory to do that. It is time for us to get to work.

We have had more than 1 million new cases just in the past week. Yet what does Leader MITCH MCCONNELL—what does he keep the Senate in session to do? He keeps the Senate in session and he puts essential workers at risk all to try to ram through an unqualified nominee who pretty much everybody in this body knows has no business serving on the Federal Reserve.

Let's be clear on what this is about. It is about our outgoing President—again, who lost the popular vote by 5 million people and lost an electoral college by a landslide—trying to sabotage our economic recovery on his way out the door. Yesterday, luckily, Senators of both parties rejected that effort. There were 80 million Americans—most ever by a lot—who voted for stability in this election. Judy Shelton, the Trump nominee, promises more Trump chaos.

You can't say you support working people while putting someone in charge who has no problem whatsoever threatening their jobs and their savings to push a bizarre intellectual agenda. She has no idea how to handle an economic

crisis like the one we are in. Her positions aren't conservative. They are not traditionally conservative, which we could debate. I would be willing to vote for conservatives, as I have before, if I thought they were qualified and their thinking was not so far, far right out of the mainstream. But her positions aren't conservative; they are disqualifying.

For three decades, she has advocated returning to the gold standard. No serious person—progressive, moderate, conservative—no serious person, left or right, still believes in the gold standard. She opposes FDIC, Federal deposit insurance—the insurance that protects your money when you put it in the bank. She has flip-flopped on these issues several times during her nomination. The only thing consistent she stands for is that she—no surprise—wants to do what Trump wants to do. But Americans have moved on from Donald Trump, 80 million strong. It is time for the Senate to move on from this failed nomination and this failed Presidency.

This nomination was a waste of time. Look what we should have been doing instead. You all know that. Every moment we spend on unnecessary, unqualified nominees like this is time the Senate isn't spending saving lives. It is time to get to work delivering results for the people whom we serve.

We are watching hospitals fill up again from Oklahoma to Ohio. Our healthcare system is getting overwhelmed. Gig workers and self-employed workers will lose their unemployment insurance at the end of the year. Small businesses and local governments are running out of money. It doesn't have to be this bad.

I have had enough and I think my colleagues in both parties have had enough of this false choice between saving the economy and combating the virus. We have to do both, and we can do both. It is not an unsolvable problem. We need the resources, and we have the resources. We are the greatest, wealthiest country on Earth. We have some of the hardest workers, the best scientists, and the smartest doctors. We have manufacturing expertise. We have natural resources. We have the world's reserve currency. We have all those things.

But President Trump and Senator MCCONNELL want you to believe we can't solve big problems; we can't use our resources to help ordinary families; we can't use our talents to produce tests and PPE; we can't use our ingenuity to figure out how to open businesses and schools safely. They have essentially thrown up their hands and said: Sorry, America, you are on your own. They want you to believe this is the best America can do. In this election, Americans made it clear they don't buy that. They have had enough of aiming low and being told: We can't do that. We can't solve this problem; it is too big. We can't govern. We can't afford it.