

am delighted that he has played an important role in this piece of legislation, as he has in so many others. And it will be, I am sure, successfully pursued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the conference report is agreed to, and the motion to reconsider the vote is laid upon the table.

The conference report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session to consider the nomination of William A. Fletcher to be a United States Circuit Judge.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM A. FLETCHER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report Executive Calendar No. 619, on which there will be 90 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William A. Fletcher, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mr. SESSIONS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the role of the Senate is to advise and consent in nominations by the President for judicial vacancies. That is understood in the Constitution. Every nominee of the President comes before the Judiciary Committee and then they come before this body for a vote. We are at this point analyzing the nomination of William Fletcher, Willie Fletcher from California, to the Ninth Circuit. I regretfully must say I have concluded that I have to oppose that nomination. And I would like to discuss the reasons why.

Most of the nominations that have come forward from the President have received favorable review by the Judiciary Committee. In fact, we cleared nine today. A number of them are on the docket today and will probably pass out today. So we are making some substantial progress.

Nearly half of the vacancies that exist now in Federal courts are because there are no nominees for those vacancies—almost half of them. But on occasion we need to stand up as a Senate and affirm certain facts about our courts and our Nation. One of the facts that we need to affirm is that courts must carry out the rule of law, that they are not there to make law. The courts are there to enforce law as written by the Congress and as written by the people through their Constitution that we adopted over 200 years ago. Also, that is, I think, where we are basically today.

With regard to this nomination, it is to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in California. Without any doubt, the Ninth Circuit is considered the most

liberal circuit in the United States. It is also the largest circuit. There are 11 circuit courts of appeals. And in the United States we have the U.S. district judges. These are the trial judges. The next level—the only intermediate level—is the courts of appeals. And they are one step below the U.S. Supreme Court. It is the courts of appeals that superintend, day after day, the activities of the district judges who practice under them.

There are more district judges in the circuit than there are circuit judges. And every appeal from a district judge's ruling, almost virtually every one, would go to the courts of appeals in California and Arizona and the States in the West that are part of the Ninth Circuit. Those appeals go to the Ninth Circuit, not directly to the U.S. Supreme Court. As they rule on those matters, they set certain policy within the circuit.

We have—I think Senator BIDEN made a speech on it once—we have 1 Constitution in this country, not 11. The circuit courts of appeals are required to show fidelity to the Supreme Court and to the Constitution. The Supreme Court is the ultimate definer of the Constitution. And the courts of appeals must take the rulings of the Supreme Court and interpret them and apply them directly to their judges who work under them or in their circuit and in fact set the standards of the law.

We do not have 11 different circuits setting 11 different policies—at least we should not. But it is a known fact that the Ninth Circuit for many years has been out of step. Last year, 28 cases from the Ninth Circuit made it to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court does not hear every case. This is why the circuits are so important.

Probably 95 percent of the cases decided by the circuits never are appealed to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court will not hear them. But they agreed to hear 28 cases from the Ninth Circuit. And of those 28 cases, they reversed 27 of them. They reversed an unprecedented number. They reversed the Ninth Circuit 27 out of the 28 times they reviewed a case from that circuit. And this is not a matter of recent phenomena.

I was a Federal prosecutor for almost 15 years, and during that time I was involved in many criminal cases. And you study the law, and you seek out cases where you can find them. Well, it was quite obvious—and Federal prosecutors all over the country used to joke about the fact that the criminal defense lawyers, whenever they could not find any law from anywhere else, they could always find a Ninth Circuit case that was favorable to the defendant. And they were constantly, even in those days, being reversed by the U.S. Supreme Court, because the U.S. Supreme Court's idea and demand is that we have one Constitution, that the law be applied uniformly.

So I just say this. The New York Times, not too many months ago,

wrote an article about the Ninth Circuit and said these words: "A majority of the U.S. Supreme Court considers the Ninth Circuit a rogue circuit, out of control. It needs to be brought back into control. They have been working on it for years but have not been able to do so."

All of that is sort of the background that we are dealing with today.

When we get a nominee to this circuit, I believe this Senate ought to utilize its advise and consent authority, constitutional duty, to ensure that the nominees to it bring that circuit from being a rogue circuit back into the mainstream of American law, so we do not have litigants time and again having adverse rulings, that they have to go to the Supreme Court—however many thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars—to get reversed.

This is serious business. Some say, "They just reversed them. Big deal." It costs somebody a lot of money, and a lot of cases that were wrong in that circuit were never accepted by the Supreme Court and were never reversed. The Supreme Court can't hear every case that comes out of every circuit. So we are dealing with a very serious matter.

The Senator from Ohio who I suspect will comment today on the nominee, Senator DeWine, articulated it well. When we evaluate nominees, we have to ask ourselves what will be the impact of that nomination on the court and the overall situation. We want to support the President. We support the President time and again. I have seen some Presidential nominees that are good nominees. I am proud to support them. There are two here today who I know personally that I think would be good Federal judges. But I can't say that about this one.

We need to send the President of the United States a message, that those Members of this body who participate in helping select nominees cannot, in good conscience, continue to accept nominations to this circuit who are not going to make it better and bring it back into the mainstream of American law.

With regard to Mr. Fletcher, he has never practiced law. The only real experience he has had outside of being a professor, was as a law clerk. His clerkship was for Justice William Brennan of the U.S. Supreme Court. That is significant and it is an honor to be selected to be a law clerk for the Supreme Court. But the truth is, Justice Brennan has always been recognized as the point man, the leading spokesman in American jurisprudence for an activist judiciary. I am not saying he is a bad man, but that is his position.

Justice Brennan used to dissent on every death penalty case, saying he adhered to the view that the death penalty was cruel and unusual punishment, and within that very Constitution he said he was interpreting, there are at least four to six references to the death penalty and capital crimes.