

trade, more opportunity to expand our economy, not contract, as we get into a downward spiral on a tariff-only strategy.

Mr. Speaker, we want to work successfully with this administration on a new and modern NAFTA and with a successful set of trading arrangements with our friends in Europe and in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HIGH STAKES ON THE HIGH COURT: JUSTICE HANGING IN THE BALANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESTES of Kansas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to anchor this CBC Special Order hour. I would like to thank our Congressional Black Caucus chairman, Representative CEDRIC RICHMOND of Louisiana, for his leadership in this effort.

For the next hour, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus and the 78 million constituents we represent. Tonight's Special Order hour theme is High Stakes on the High Court: Justice Hanging in the Balance.

As one-fourth of the Democratic Caucus, we are emphatic in our opposition of Donald Trump's USA Supreme Court nominee, Brett Kavanaugh.

During the 2016 election, a then-candidate Trump, in his sole attempt to appeal to African American voters, asked: "What do you have to lose?"

Well, it turns out, my fellow Americans, we have so much to lose. In fact, we have lost already under Donald Trump.

Every time Donald Trump and the congressional Republicans undermine and sabotage healthcare, Black and Brown folks lose.

When congressional Republicans and Donald Trump give their billionaire donors and the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans such a massive tax cut and then raise taxes on low and middle class families, working class families, Black and Brown folks, lose.

When Donald Trump threatened temporary protected status, TPS, Black and Brown folks lost.

And with the recent announcement of Brett Kavanaugh as the President's

nominee, Black and Brown folks now have even more to lose.

The stakes have never been higher. For nearly eight decades, African Americans have arduously, through generations of sacrifice and protest, successfully fought to secure historic legal victories that have significantly bent the moral arc of the universe towards justice. Republicans want to destroy a generation of progress for civil rights, women's rights, LGBTQ rights, workers' rights, and healthcare.

Brett Kavanaugh's nomination solidifies the Republican agenda to roll back major social legislative victories that would impede our advancements in social justice. With the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh, we are looking at the most conservative Supreme Court in over 75 years. Everything we hold dear as American ideals—our freedom, our tolerance, our values and progress in improving the human condition in our Nation—are at risk.

We know Brett Kavanaugh has a record of ruling against affordable healthcare and women's rights, but what is even more troubling is how his record on racial issues have flown under the radar.

We cannot consider a Supreme Court Justice without analyzing their views on such issues as voting and workforce rights that will have an overwhelming effect on the life and liberty of all people of color.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the chairwoman of the judicial task force of the Congressional Black Caucus, whom it is now my honor and privilege to present and who has an extraordinary record of legal acumen and has been an outspoken advocate for criminal justice reform, social justice, and has been scrutinizing judicial nominations so that we can provide for the American people an analysis of what we have to lose.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York, and I particularly thank her for her very cogent remarks and wish to associate myself with those remarks in every sense of the word; and I say so to the good lady from the State of New York as the leader of the CBC task force on Federal court nominations, including the Supreme Court nomination, where I have had the opportunity to look deeply at the decisions of this nominee now serving on the court of appeals, as it turns out, for the District of Columbia, Brett Kavanaugh.

I think the gentlewoman's remarks are telling in their understanding of the extreme damage he would do—and I must add not only to African Americans, but to the rule of law as we have known it.

I rise to indicate that the Congressional Black Caucus stands in strong opposition to the nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh, and we will be doing all we can to keep that nomination from proceeding to the floor of the Sen-

ate. We do have two members of the Congressional Black Caucus on the Judiciary Committee in the Senate, and we are working closely with them as well.

We in the Congressional Black Caucus are not the only Members of Congress opposed to this nomination, but we represent those Americans who have been disproportionately dependent on a fair Supreme Court. African Americans have always been a minority group in our country. For that reason, from slavery on to the days of discrimination in the 19th and 20th centuries, the African American community has been particularly dependent on the courts of the United States to protect them from unequal treatment by the majority.

We have had every reason to know that, if we are in the hands of the partisan majority, given 400 years of history, we have no protection. African Americans are disproportionately dependent on an objective Supreme Court. Now, that doesn't mean a Supreme Court of our choosing, but a Supreme Court that is open to all points of view and capable of seeing beyond partisanship.

Brett Kavanaugh is not that nominee. We know so because he has perhaps the longest record of opinions of names submitted to Republicans for review.

The D.C. circuit, which is the federal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which happens to be my district, has been a circuit where Kavanaugh has been very mindful of the Supreme Court. I say that because he has so often written in dissent from his own colleagues on a Republican Court that it has been as if he were trying to write his way onto the Supreme Court.

Remember Kavanaugh's background. He started his career as a political operative in the Bush administration, and he has brought that extreme partnership, as a political operative, straight into the D.C. circuit.

We are not asking the Senate for a nominee of the kind we would have chosen. That is not our demand. But because this is the most partisan Congress since the Civil War, I believe we are within our rights in asking for a Court that would be a stabilizing influence so the American people could see that not all is lost because there is an objective actor on the scene, and that actor is the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is that Court which has protected us, we who are African Americans, from unequal treatment ever since *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954. That does not mean that African Americans have always won at the Supreme Court level, but they have always had reason to believe that there was a court of last resort that would be open to them.

We no longer would have that sense of openness to their views if Brett Kavanaugh becomes the nominee put

forward in this session. We have seen no evidence that he would adhere to equal protection of the laws.

I will cite some examples that illustrate where his views in his cases lead that he would not protect the long-held holding of the courts that no American can be arrested without probable cause, that he would not protect even the separation of powers, and that he would not uphold the rights of Americans to qualify for affordable healthcare.

All of those notions have a disproportionate effect on African Americans, though they affect every American in the United States.

Remember, Judge Kavanaugh would be appointed to a Court that already has a majority appointed by Republican Presidents. Yet, while sitting on the D.C. court of appeals, he has distinguished himself by seeking to overturn long-existing precedent, even when members of that court, also appointed by Republican Presidents, have disagreed with him.

Let me give an example in an area of criminal law.

We now see African Americans in the streets protesting overzealous law enforcement because African American men have been shot and killed and people go to the streets because, if you can't get justice to the courts, that is all they have.

□ 2030

Yet, Judge Kavanaugh has suggested that it is appropriate for the probable cause standard to be more "flexible." Why?

Virtually no police have indeed been indicted, even given the evidence of African Americans shot down in the streets. Why do we need to narrow the ancient probable cause requirement?

He has indicated that police searches without a warrant or individualized suspicion should be allowed. He has even praised narrowing the rights long ago afforded to all defendants against incriminatory statements against themselves. How deep does that go in American constitutional law? How dangerous would it be to have a justice who would question the right against self incrimination?

Judge Kavanaugh's extreme views also show no respect for the fundamental right of women to make decisions about their own bodies, even though, 45 years ago, the Supreme Court itself established the right to abortion. That is a controversial right in our country, but it has withstood the test of time.

Let me offer an indication from a recent decision by Brett Kavanaugh, which his own court had to overturn, that shows he has no respect for precedent. That is perhaps our chief issue with this nominee. Precedent must be respected or else we are all open to whatever Congress or the Court wants to do.

A young woman, immigrant, undocumented, sought an abortion. As it turns out, she had gone through the most

rigorous of requirements, those required by Texas, because that is where she entered the country. This matter came to the D.C. court of appeals, however.

Judge Kavanaugh found, with the time running—remember, if abortions are to be performed, they are to be performed, according to the Supreme Court, as early as possible—found that more time was needed because she needed a sponsor, something that the Supreme Court has never required, in order for that abortion to occur. The court overturned Judge Kavanaugh's opinion. Look how dangerous it would have been. She could have gone past the 12-week, the 15-week, the 20-week deadline, which the House has approved on occasion.

These are rights not to be tampered with, but he has already tampered with them on the court of appeals. This court, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia—and I won't go into all the cases—has shown that he is an executive-oriented justice. That is to say, whatever the President wants, the President gets. This is the court that looks at most administrative law decisions before they go anywhere else.

Kavanaugh tried to strike down the net neutrality rule. Now, that is controversial here in Congress. But the basis he used for the courts to do it, the majority said—remember, this is a majority which our Republican President has appointed—the majority noted that the dissent was, using their words, "misconceived" because Kavanaugh claimed a First Amendment protection for large internet service providers never found by any court, and certainly not the Supreme Court but found to be, again, by his Republican colleagues on the D.C. Circuit, to be "counterintuitive."

I cannot go through each and every one of Judge Kavanaugh's decisions here, but I must point to perhaps his most extreme opinion. In a decision on the Affordable Care Act, this is what a jurist in the United States of America said, and I quote:

"Under the Constitution, the President may decline to enforce a statute that regulates private individuals when the President deems the statute unconstitutional, even if a court has held or would hold the statute constitutional."

That is bold. It says that the President may choose to rise above the law and enforce a law even if found unconstitutional. The Congress of the United States should not be willing to go along with this. I cite a case on my side of an issue but surely you can see the implications for yours.

The President is supposed to make sure to "take care that the laws are faithfully executed." To faithfully execute that law, you would have to enforce whatever the Congress or the Courts had found.

Of course, most concerning for many is his view of the special counsel where he has opined that it may be unconstitutional, and there is every reason to

believe that he may well believe that Mueller's special counsel role should be struck down.

A Republican President is entitled to a Republican nominee. He is not entitled to a nominee whose opinions fly in the face of the law for the last 75 years.

Judge Brett Kavanaugh's long list of opinions mark an extreme departure from established American constitutional and other law. We ask that every effort be made to oppose a man who would ignore established precedent, even precedent that his own conservative colleagues agree with, and who, I believe, cannot uphold the law fairly to protect the rights of all American citizens.

We believe that the first to feel the effect of such a nominee would be the millions of Americans who are of African American ancestry whom the Congressional Black Caucus represents.

I thank my good friend, again, from New York, for permitting me to go on at length about some of the precedents I have discovered that I thought would be particularly troubling, not only to the African American community, but to the American people.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her scholarship, her legal acumen, and really providing a snapshot—because I am sure there are many more troubling decisions that you have uncovered—but giving us this snapshot into the breaking of norms that this nominee presents to the American people.

It is really important that we do everything within our power to educate and inform the public so that they can make an informed choice in terms of how they would like to proceed in appealing to the United States Congress, which has the authority for the nomination process. At this time, again, I would like to thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), who is my classmate and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for the time today to address this august body.

Let me first compliment the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C., Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, a true legal scholar, a legal patriot, and a fighter for justice throughout her life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to issue this quote to you: "No President has ever consulted more widely or talked with more people from more backgrounds to seek input about a Supreme Court nomination."

Mr. Speaker, those were the first words spoken by Supreme Court nominee Brett Kavanaugh, introduced to the American people during President Trump's prime-time reality show announcement this past Monday night.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to voice my deep concerns regarding the President's nomination of Judge Kavanaugh

for a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States of America. It is more than a little disquieting that the first thing to come from a newly named Supreme Court nominee's mouth was a demonstrably false statement claiming that the search to replace retiring Justice Anthony Kennedy was one of the most far-reaching and thorough in the history of the republic.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that President Trump nominated Brett Kavanaugh from a preapproved list of prospective right-wing ideologue nominees prepared by the extremist Heritage Foundation, in consultation with the cultish right-wing Federalist Society, each of those nominees having been certified as having passed the Federalist Society, Heritage Foundation litmus test on overturning *Roe v. Wade* and striking down critical protections in our current healthcare system.

Just 10 days after Justice Kennedy announced his retirement, Judge Kavanaugh makes the absurd statement that no President has ever consulted more widely or talked with more people from more backgrounds to seek input about a Supreme Court nomination.

We have come to expect knowing false Trumpian statements from the President's employees, his doctor, communications directors, his press secretaries, but not from a nominee for the branch of government designated to be a check on his administration.

In just a few words, Judge Kavanaugh aligned himself with the likes of erstwhile press secretary Sean Spicer, who claimed that Trump's inauguration crowd was larger than Obama's. He put himself in the same league with the disgraced doctor who felt it necessary to tell the world the spurious claim that the President was the healthiest human being in world history.

That a distinguished Federal appellate judge felt the need to debase himself with obvious untruths just moments after his nomination to the highest court in the land was announced should cause each and every one of us to fear that a Justice Kavanaugh would willingly prostrate himself before a demanding President if called upon to do so.

Moreover, each and every one of us has good cause to believe that the nomination of Judge Kavanaugh is a blatant attempt by President Trump to dominate the judiciary.

□ 2045

A President with the power and the predisposition to place his heavy hand on the delicate scales of justice would inevitably lead our dear Nation to the precipice of a constitutional crisis. That is why it is of such concern to me that nominee Kavanaugh felt it necessary to flatter this insecure President during their prime time reality show at the White House last week.

In Washington, we talk a lot about the balance of powers, but at home, in

Georgia, we feel it. We feel the 5-4 *Shelby* decision striking down important parts of the Voting Rights Act. We feel *Roe v. Wade* guaranteeing women the right to choose. We feel *Citizens United*. And we feel *Brown v. Board of Education*. We recall the power of the courts to decide so much more than individual cases. We have seen its ability to change the course of history. When one considers the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, we know firsthand that the U.S. Supreme Court can turn the American Dream into the American nightmare.

Without digressing, I must point out that to conclude that a sycophantic debut is where Judge Kavanaugh's problems begin and end would be dangerously naive. The briefest of examinations of his record reveals numerous positions contrary to the values held by most Americans.

He has opposed EPA protections, workers' rights, consumer protections, and the right to choose. And his personal statements call to question his ability to be an independent check on the President, such as his declarations that investigations of presidents should be deferred while that president is in office, and his opinion that a sitting president is immune from criminal charges.

These statements should be particularly troubling for all Americans, as the Supreme Court may soon be called upon to consider whether President Trump can be subpoenaed to appear before a Federal grand jury, or whether a sitting president can be indicted. Our democracy will need an unbiased and principled Supreme Court functioning at its finest, with due respect for the rule of law, when that time comes, and a justice who has prejudged, as Judge Kavanaugh has, would jeopardize that responsibility.

To avoid any appearance of impropriety, the Senate should not consider a Supreme Court appointment from a president who is under the cloud of investigation for conspiracy to violate the law and the obstruction of that investigation. Judge Kavanaugh's statements clearly make him suspect, and his confirmation would undermine the credibility of the Nation's highest court and impugn that court's ability to protect public confidence in the rule of law.

With this cloud hanging over Judge Kavanaugh's nomination, it is necessary that the Senate refrain and keep with its tradition and follow the McConnell rule. Elections are less than 4 months away and we should allow the American people to speak at the ballot box before the Senate is asked to confirm a nominee for the highest court in the land. The delay would help ensure that Justice Kennedy's replacement is free from suspicion and bias and the inability to appreciate balance of powers concerns.

Judge Kavanaugh has gone beyond his clear proclivity for being an activist judge out of line with the rest of the

country. He has revealed himself to be beholden to another branch of government, which would imperil our Constitution's delicate balance of powers.

Americans deserve a United States Supreme Court justice who is up to the task of protecting the rule of law without fear or favor, and, unfortunately, Judge Kavanaugh's appointment is ill-considered, ill-timed, and should not move forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Fourth District of Georgia for sharing his analysis this evening. Indeed, he has raised some very important points that we need to consider and that I would like the American people to consider.

There is a McConnell rule. That rule held up the nomination of Merrick Garland for almost a year. The context which that was done was that apparently there were going to be elections down the road and the American people should speak.

Well, here we are less than 5 months out before there will be an election here in the United States of America. I think the people have an opportunity, and should use that opportunity through their franchise, to register their concerns about this nomination process.

Nearly 150 years ago, Black Americans were granted the right to vote. It will be another 100 years before people of color could freely vote in every State, county, and city in the United States of America. We have fought tooth and nail for the most sacred power in America—the power to vote—and now that power is being challenged with the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court.

In 2012, Judge Kavanaugh wrote an opinion that upheld South Carolina's restrictive voter ID laws, despite knowing they would disenfranchise voters and disproportionately harm people of color.

Voter ID laws are another thinly veiled attempt at preventing people of color from participating in elections. Kavanaugh's support of these laws show what side of history he is on.

This isn't the only questionable decision he has made regarding race relations. He has a long history of concerning decisions and writings.

In 1989, Kavanaugh published his first piece of legal writing challenging a Supreme Court ruling that barred prosecutors from excluding jurists based on race. Imagine that: 1989.

Kavanaugh also wrote a brief for the Center for Equal Opportunity, a conservative think tank that opposed affirmative action and opposed the issue in a number of different court cases.

Kavanaugh is also a firm supporter of the NSA, and its surveilling techniques that have been known to disproportionately target people of color.

The NAACP opposed Kavanaugh's nomination to the D.C. Circuit Court, and their concerns were only strengthened by his proven track record of only supporting the already wealthy and powerful.

In 2000, Kavanaugh was on the legal team that helped stop the Florida recount and secure the Bush Presidency.

Just last year, Kavanaugh wrote a dissenting opinion concerning whether a pregnant 17-year-old being held by immigration authorities was allowed to leave their custody to obtain an abortion.

We are not dealing with someone who is a mystery here. It is very clear where he stands in terms of turning back the hands of time. And, as my colleagues have already stated, his opinions have been so far to the right of even a Republican D.C. Circuit Court, that it is alarming that at a time when we need justice at the Supreme Court level that is blind, that will advance humankind, this is the nominee, the nominee that was put forth by the Heritage Foundation, the nominee that is a part of the Federalist society: very telling.

Well, let me just say this: In Texas, the court ruled in agreement that that teenager, who was seeking an abortion, was legally entitled to access it.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will just say a few remarks. As a Black woman, I know how critical the Supreme Court is to American liberty and freedom. It was the Supreme Court that ended segregation with *Brown v. Board of Education*, ended the process of poll taxes and voter suppression with *Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections*, and has continued to stand up for American justice when Donald Trump and our Congress could not. The legacy of this great institution will crumble if we confirm Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressional Black Caucus and Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE for anchoring this important Special Order.

On the 150th Anniversary of the ratification of the 14th Amendment, a landmark moment for progress and equality, the President announced his nominee to fill a seat on the highest court in the land.

Unfortunately, however, the search for the next jurist to take a seat on the United States Supreme Court resembled a circus and I am concerned that the person selected, Brett Kavanaugh, will be antagonistic and hostile to the progress that the 14th Amendment has helped achieve.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, I am appalled by the manner in which the President is pursuing this solemn obligation and concerned by the choice this process may yield.

The President has used the levers of his office to divide, rather than unite.

The Supreme Court is not just any court.

In our great Republic, it is the tribunal of last resort and routinely resolves constitutional questions of first impression.

The American people rely on it to interpret some of society's most difficult policy concerns, and to correct the excesses of the popularly-elected branches.

The nature of the Court requires justices, not ideologues, and individuals who have integrity and empathy.

This is why this task requires seriousness and solemnity, and not spectacle.

Instead, this process resembled a circus: contenders were selected based on their ability to pass a litmus test of a narrow perspective of conservatism which limits justice; a group of judges, similar in background, training and experience, curated by the hyper-conservative Federalist Society; and, a heavily-promoted, prime time television announcement, replete with different frontrunner candidates on different days.

Given this reality, Americans are rightly concerned that the President's jurist selection to one of this country's three coequal branches of government is being outsourced to the whims of a narrow ideological and partisan organization when, in actuality, a seat on the Supreme Court should be reserved for only the most profound jurists in the nation.

By great numbers, the American people support reform in any number of areas.

In a time of mass incarceration and overcrowded prisons, a poll conducted earlier this year by a Republican-leaning organization indicates that over three-quarters of the American people support significant criminal justice reform.

Americans are also skeptical of comments made by this President, advocating for the deprivation of due process rights for a variety of individuals, from refugees seeking safety within our borders, to those already here, charged with crimes.

Indeed, a poll commissioned by the Bucknell Institute for Public Policy within the last year reveals broad and deep support for due process rights.

In a time when our political parties appear polarized, 67 percent of Democrats, 77 percent of Republicans and 67 percent of Independents support due process for individuals who face serious criminal charges.

Last, the Supreme Court is also the tribunal that resolves major questions about the form and contours of our federal government, including sensitive questions like "can a sitting president pardon himself?" or "can a sitting president be indicted?"

In fact, for over the past year of this President's administration, the country has been forced to consider these questions as it learned that the Russians interfered with the 2016 presidential election and associates of the president may have abetted that endeavor.

Recent polls indicate that, by clear margins, the American people do not believe the President is above the law or that a president can pardon himself.

It is vital that this extremely influential position is filled by someone who subscribes to these core principles.

Brett Kavanaugh, however, has demonstrated a long-standing record of troubling opinions, including the beliefs that: the president is above the law and should never be criminally indicted; the Affordable Care Act should be dismantled; religious expression trumps individuals' right to health coverage for birth control; access to abortion should be diminished; and Obama-era environmental regulations should be rolled back.

The Supreme Court is also required to examine contemporary policies through the prism of our nation's long history.

In that regard, the ongoing struggle for civil rights cannot be subjugated as a priority of a nation seeking to bind the wounds of the slavery, the Civil War and its vestiges.

The next jurist will replace a Supreme Court justice who recognized the importance of affirmative action as a necessary means to help heal the scars of segregation and Jim Crow. The next jurist will likely be required to further calibrate the balance of power between labor unions and their employing entities.

Given the importance of these and other issues, like voting rights, reproductive rights, the rights of the LGBTQ community, and countless others, scholars of the Supreme Court and others who believe the Court is the arbiter of fair justice are looking to this nomination and are looking for a jurist who will dispense justice which is not one-sided or tilts to the right, but rather fair justice.

As I stated before the nomination, I call upon the United States Senate to reject any nominee that is a well-documented ideologue and to nonetheless probatively, seriously, and deeply question whether and how this jurist could damage rights of minorities, women, children, and society's most vulnerable.

When confronted with a replacement to the Supreme Court's swing vote, this President has chosen an ideologue and a foot soldier of the Republican Party and the conservative movement.

Among other swing decisions, Justice Kennedy acted as the deciding vote in almost every reproductive health case since his confirmation, including casting the deciding vote to ensure abortion remained legal in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* in 1992.

The President has stated numerous times that he will appoint someone who will reverse *Roe v. Wade*, and many anti-choice groups have rallied behind Judge Kavanaugh's nomination.

In addition to women's rights and health care, other paramount issues are on the line, such as voting rights and affirmative action.

Bedrock civil rights principles such as *Brown v. Board of Education* could be at stake.

To be sure, Brett Kavanaugh has very good credentials but an undistinguished record as a jurist on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

But it is not his credentials or his pedigree that is worrisome.

Rather, throughout his entire career—as a deputy in the right-wing crusade against President Bill Clinton during the 1990s, as a political operative fighting against the statewide recount in Florida in 2000, paving the way for the Supreme Court's decision in *Bush v. Gore*, and as a conservative stalwart on the country's most important federal appellate court—Brett Kavanaugh has used his talents in the service of decidedly and uncompromisingly reactionary causes.

I urge the United States Senate to reject this nomination and send this President a message: select a nominee that will not politicize the Court and one who will protect the rights of minorities, women, children, and society's most vulnerable.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the