

some point in time Sunday or early Monday morning that that would be the end of the session, at least for the period of time prior to Christmas?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for yielding and for the question. We have certainly given every indication in every meeting, the Speaker has, I have today, that that would be our timetable, that we would finish, possibly some things could carry over into early Monday morning, but we would not be here on Monday for any official actions of that regard on Monday, though there may be some pro forma thing that has to be done that I am not aware of standing here.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope on behalf of my side, and I have talked to my friend from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) on the other side, I know both of us want to bring this session to a close. Members had hoped to be home certainly this weekend. Christmas is a week from tomorrow. I am hopeful that we can conclude tomorrow, and I would hope that we would all work towards that end.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING RECOGNITION OF HELEN SEWELL'S RETIREMENT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I have a brief announcement. The announcement is that we would also plan in our activities tomorrow to have a brief recognition of Helen Sewell, who has run the cloakroom here for a long period of time. Between she and her father, who started work here 87 years ago, they have been a continued presence in the cloakroom on this side. Tomorrow will be Helen's last official day before she retires.

□ 1945

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

Mr. HOYER, Maryland
Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
December 15, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 1909 (b) of SAFETEA-LU (P.L. 109-59), I hereby appoint to the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission the following individuals:

Mr. Frank J. Busalacchi, Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, of Brookfield, Wisconsin.

Mr. Steve Heminger, Executive Director of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, of San Francisco, California.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Nancy Pelosi, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, December 15, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 1238(b)(3) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2001 (P.L. 106-398), I hereby reappoint Ms. Carolyn Bartholomew of the District of Columbia and Mr. George Becker of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission for two-year terms expiring December 31, 2007. Their current terms expire December 31, 2005.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

(Mr. MEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership is trying to add to the Defense authorization bill a controversial piece of legislation by Mr. PENCE that would blow the lid off the Campaign Finance Reform Act that Republicans and Democrats joined together to support and pass into law and that President Bush signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, this country is at war. We need a Defense authorization bill to assist the men and women who are serving our Armed Forces. We have reached an agreement on that bill to help our troops; and now, at the last minute, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee wants to take a controversial piece of campaign finance reform legislation and insert it into that bill.

He was exposed by the other Chamber. The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee took the floor and condemned it; and now he still wants to add this legislation, controversial legislation, against the public interest. He wants to attach it to a Defense bill at a time when this country is at war.

Surely we can do better on this holiday weekend. It is despicable, and I hope this leadership stands up to this. This is one of the worst things I have ever seen this Republican leadership do. A piece of controversial legislation to a Defense bill at a time of war.

EXTREME ALITO VIEWS

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am struck by the extent to which the right wing seems not to understand how unpopular their agenda is. It is their inability to get a majority for it that keeps us here so many days after we should have gone.

It is also interesting to watch them try to deny the very, very deep conservatism of the nominee for the Supreme Court, Judge Alito. They are hiding his views on abortion. Recently, in the Boston Globe, an article by Kenneth Starr and Ronald Cass tried to explain away one of the most astounding examples of his extreme conservatism: his opposition to the basic principle of one man, one vote as articulated by the Warren Court. And given the difficulty of trying to get someone confirmed who has views that extreme, these two advocates tried to explain it away by claiming it was all about gerrymandering and proportional representation.

Fortunately, Professor Michael Tolley of Northeastern University wrote a very good letter exposing the inaccuracy of this attempted defense of Judge Alito and reaffirming that in fact what was involved in his 1985 statement was an objection to that basic principle of democracy articulated by the Warren Court, that it should be one man, one vote.

The following are the inaccurate article and the correction:

ALITO'S STICKY THICKET

(By Kenneth W. Starr and Ronald A. Cass)

A Political sidebar that made surprising news the last few weeks is a phrase in a 1986 job application from now-Judge Sam Alito questioning the Warren Court's reappointment decisions. That tidbit sent shock waves through the political and pundit classes.

It shouldn't have. Justice-to-be Alito's statement wasn't an attack on equality, voting rights, or protecting victims of racial discrimination. It was a simple observation that a liberal court created a doctrine that, however salutary, has significant problems.

Americans have long embraced the idea of equality from "all men are created equal" forward. Equality did not mean identical political influence in every respect. Yet the past 40 years have seen repeated judicial efforts to prescribe something that looks like